JESUS AND OUR GENERATION

CHARLES WHITNEY GILKEY

JESUS AND OUR GENERATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY
NEW YORK

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA, LIMITED
TORONTO

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA
TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO, FUKUOKA, SENDAI

THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY
SHANGHAI

THE BARROWS LECTURES · 1924 · 25

JESUS AND OUR GENERATION

By

CHARLES WHITNEY GILKEY, A.M., D.D.

Minister of the Hyde Park Baptist Church, Chicago

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

CHICAGO · ILLINOIS

LIBRARY OF TMJ TODD M. JOHNSON

COPYRIGHT 1925 BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

All Rights Reserved

Published December 1925

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

TO THE DEAR MEMORY OF

ERNEST DEWITT BURTON

PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1923-25

BY WHOSE APPOINTMENT THESE LECTURES WERE GIVEN; BY WHOSE WISDOM THEY WERE COUNSELED; BY WHOSE SPIRIT THEY WERE INSPIRED

CONTENTS

PAGE

THE BARROWS LECTURESHIP FOUNDATION ix

AUTHOR'S PREFACE xiii

LECTURE

I. JESUS AND OUR GENERATION 1

II. JESUS' WAY OF LIFE 29

III. JESUS' LIFE WITH GOD 55

IV. JESUS AND THE MYSTERIES OF LIFE AND DEATH . 85

V. THE LORDSHIP OF JESUS 117

VI. JESUS AND THE FUTURE 151

INDEX 181

THE BARROWS LECTURESHIP FOUNDATION

The Barrows Lectureship was established in 1894 by Mrs. Caroline E. Haskell. The first course of lectures was delivered during the winter of 1896–97 by Dr. John Henry Barrows, in whose honor the lectureship was named. Dr. Barrows gave one or more lectures in each of the following cities: Calcutta, Lucknow, Cawnpore, Delhi, Lahore, Amritzar, Agra, Jeypore, Ajmere, Indore, Ahmednagar, Poona, Bangalore, Vellore, Madras, Madura, Palamcotta, Tinnevelly, and Colombo. This course of lectures has been published under the title, "Christianity, the World Religion." The second course of Barrows Lectures was delivered in Calcutta, and elsewhere in India, by Dr. A. M. Fairbairn, principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, during the winter of 1898–99. This course of lectures has not been published. The third course was delivered in India, Ceylon, and Japan, by Dr. Charles Cuthbert Hall, during the winter of 1902–3, and has been published under the title, "Christian Belief Interpreted by Christian Experience." The fourth course was also given by Dr.

Hall in 1906–7, the subject being "Christ and the Eastern Soul." Publication took place in 1909. The fifth course was on "Social Programmes in the West," by Professor Charles R. Henderson, given in 1912–13 and published in the latter year.

The letter of Mrs. Haskell to President Harper, in which she proposes to establish this lectureship in the University of Chicago, is as follows:

Chicago, October 12, 1894

President William R. Harper

My dear Sir: I take pleasure in offering to the University of Chicago the sum of twenty thousand dollars for the founding of a second Lectureship on the Relations of Christianity and the Other Religions. These lectures, six or more in number, are to be given in Calcutta (India) and, if deemed best, in Bombay, Madras, or some other of the chief cities of Hindustan, where large numbers of the educated Hindus are familiar with the English language. The wish so earnestly expressed by Mr. P. C. Mozoomdar, that a lectureship like that which I had the privilege of founding last summer might be provided for India, has led me to consider the desirability of establishing in some great collegiate center like Calcutta a course of lectures to be given either annually or, as may seem better, biennially, by leading Christian scholars of Europe, Asia, and America, in which, in a friendly, temperate, and conciliatory way, and in the fraternal spirit which pervaded the Parliament of Religions, the great questions of the truths of Christianity, its harmonies with the truths of other religions, its rightful claims, and the best methods of setting them forth, should be presented to the scholarly and thoughtful people of India.

It is my purpose to identify this work, which, I believe, will be a work of enlightenment and fraternity, with the University Extension Department of the University of Chicago, and it is my desire that the management of this Lectureship should lie with yourself, as president of all the departments of the University; with Rev. John Henry Barrows, D.D., the professorial lecturer of Comparative Religion; with Professor George S. Goodspeed, the associate professor of Comparative Religion; and with those who shall be your and their successors in these positions. It is my request that this lectureship shall bear the name of John Henry Barrows, who has identified himself with the work of promoting friendly relations between Christian America and the people of India. The committee having the management of these lectures shall also have the authority to determine whether any of the courses shall be given in Asiatic or other cities outside of India.

In reading the proceedings of the Parliament of Religions I have been struck with the many points of harmony between the different faiths, and by the possibility of so presenting Christianity to others as to win their favorable interest in its truths. If the committee shall decide to utilize this Lectureship still further in calling forth the views of scholarly representatives of non-Christian faiths, I authorize and shall approve such a decision. Only good will grow out of such a comparison of views. . . . .

It is my wish that, accepting the offer I now make, the committee of the University will correspond with the leaders of religious thought in India and secure from them such helpful suggestions as they may readily give. I cherish the expectation that the Barrows Lectures will prove, in the years that shall come, a new golden bond between the East and West. In the belief that this foundation will be blessed by our Heavenly Father to the extension of the benign influence of our great University, to the

promotion of the highest interests of humanity, and to the enlargement of the Kingdom of Truth and Love on earth, I remain, with much regard,

Yours sincerely,

Caroline E. Haskell

In conformity with this letter of gift the following principles and regulations governing the Barrows Lectureship have been established:

1. A Committee, consisting of the President of the University of Chicago and the Professor of Comparative Religion, is intrusted with the management of the Lectureship.

2. Nominations to the Lectureship are made by the Committee and confirmed by the Board of Trustees of the University.

3. The lecturer holds office for two years, during which period he is expected to deliver the series of lectures in a place or places agreed upon between himself and the Committee.

4. During his term of office, or in the year following its expiration, the lecturer is expected to publish his lectures, at the University of Chicago Press, in the series known as "The Barrows Lectures," and to deposit two copies of the same with the Librarian of the University of Chicago, one of which is to be placed in the General Library of the University, the other in the Departmental Library of Comparative Religion.

5. The Committee is empowered to add to these regulations any others which shall be in harmony with the terms or spirit of the Letter of Gift.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

The Barrows Lectureship to India, like many another international enterprise, was sadly interrupted by the Great War. In the twenty years after its establishment, five courses of lectures were given in the Orient upon this Foundation, the last by Dr. Charles R. Henderson in 1912–13. The twelve years between his visit and the present series brought not only the great convulsion in the West with its world-wide consequences, but also changes in the East which, although perhaps less tragically spectacular, are likely to prove not less epoch-making. Nowhere have these post-war developments been more marked or more significant than in India. It is indeed a "changing East" to which a Barrows lecturer goes in these confused days.

The initiative for the resumption of the lectures after this long and transforming interval came from some younger American missionary leaders long familiar with India, who felt that the very flux and confusion of the situation there offered a unique opportunity for just such international interpretation and spiritual interchange as the Barrows Foundation was established to promote. A pro-

longed correspondence with many others who know and love India convinced President Ernest D. Burton, of the University of Chicago, as chairman of the Barrows Trustees, that the time was indeed ripe for the sixth series.

The appointment of the lecturer and the designation of the subject were announced together. It was evidently felt that this time the lecturer might well be one who could speak for and to the younger generation, which is not less self-conscious in the Orient than in the West. This major qualification—obviously more influential in the appointment than any erudition or reputation—is one which in the nature of things the present lecturer has done nothing to earn, and is equally powerless to retain.

Even more significant for the present religious situation in India was the subject set for the lectures by the trustees, as it had been suggested and confirmed by their preliminary survey. Neither then nor since has it been gathered into a single compact phrase; but its central intention has always been perfectly clear. India is more interested in and attracted by the figure of Jesus, as distinguishable from the doctrines about him and the historical movements and institutions that have taken his name, than ever in her history before.

The lectures, taking advantage of this marked interest and seeking to further it, were to set him forth as the source and sum of what is most central and vital in the Christian religion. Their subject is Jesus himself as our own generation sees him.

As the plans for the lectures began to take shape, three important decisions were speedily reached. In view of the complexity of the present Indian situation, the primary interest of this Foundation in India, and the limitation of the lecturer's leave of absence to six months, it was decided not to continue the custom by which Dr. Hall's and Dr. Henderson's lectures were repeated in China and Japan, but to concentrate this course in India. This at once made it possible to spend several weeks in important Indian centers before the actual delivery of the lectures—an experience of the utmost value. The arrangements for the lectures were intrusted to an executive committee in India, of which Dr. S. K. Datta served as the very efficient chairman. Local committees representing diverse interests, races, and religious faiths took full charge in each of the centers visited. The wisdom of all these decisions, especially the last, was amply justified by the event.

The lectures were prepared in Great Britain and Palestine during the summer and fall of 1924,

and were delivered in India from November, 1924, through February, 1925. The full series of six lectures was given successively in six chief student centers: Bombay, Lucknow, Lahore, Calcutta, Rangoon in Burma, and Madras. Four of the lectures were also delivered in Ceylon; three at Colombo, one at Kandy. The audiences were a surprise and an encouragement, not only to the lecturer, but to the responsible committees. In Calcutta and Madras a hall seating about one thousand was overcrowded night after night, and the closing audience in Madras numbered eighteen hundred by actual count. The large majority of the audiences was university students and graduates, and a still larger proportion non-Christian; so marked is the interest of present-day India, and especially of young India, in Jesus.

The lectures were always freely spoken rather than read from manuscript. This method of delivery made possible repeated revision of the material, and constant adjustment to the problems and interest of the hearers, as these were revealed in hundreds of personal interviews at the hours set apart each day for personal conference. The final revision of the lectures for publication cannot, of course, include whatever of "local color" this method of delivery made possible. It does not

therefore reproduce exactly any lecture as it was actually delivered at any center. The substance, however, is here. It is printed in the hope that it may help to clarify and stimulate that fresh vision of Jesus himself, which is to our Christian faith the acute spiritual need, not only of the Orient, but of our western world no less.

CHARLES W. GILKEY

October 7, 1925

LECTURE I

JESUS AND OUR GENERATION

My first word is to those of you who are students. Just before I left America I attended two student conferences made up of hundreds of delegates from scores of colleges and universities, representing many thousands of students in our central and western states. At both of these gatherings I was instructed by the students themselves to convey their fraternal and most cordial greetings to the students of India whom I might meet upon this journey. In Cairo, where I spoke to two audiences largely made up of Egyptian students, and again in Jerusalem, the same significant thing happened. I have great pleasure, therefore, in delivering to you who are Indian students the greetings of your fellow-students in America, in Palestine, and in Egypt.

My next word is to those among you who may remember any of the previous series of Barrows Lectures. The Barrows Lectureship is to me personally much more than an honorable appointment: it is a sacred trust. Charles Cuthbert Hall,

best beloved of all Barrows lecturers, the only one to receive a reappointment for a second visit to the Orient, was my honored teacher and my dear friend. When he came to India the second time, in 1906–7, I was a student in the institution of which he was then president. The last talk I ever had with him, after his return to America, has deeply influenced the course of my whole life; the night after he died I watched by his body; and more than once during the seventeen years since I have stood by the cross that marks his grave, with its well-earned inscription from the Book of Acts, "Passing through he preached the gospel."

When, three years later, I took up my present work near the University of Chicago, I found Charles Richmond Henderson the beloved Chaplain of the University, one of its foremost scholars and its greatest saint. When, in 1912–13, he came to the Orient as the last Barrows lecturer, we who were his neighbors and friends followed his journey round the world with eager interest. All too soon thereafter, worn out by labors too abundant, he passed to his rich reward. It fell to me as his pastor to share in his funeral service. I shall never forget the tribute one of the most eminent of his colleagues on the faculty whispered to me just after

the final benediction at his grave: "There lies the one man who has ever made religion real to me."

Those of you who knew or heard Dr. Hall and Dr. Henderson will understand, therefore, with what personal feelings of humble and reverent affection I take up a task which these two scholarly and saintly men were the last to lay down. You will see at once that I do not come to India with the ripe wisdom and international renown of my four predecessors in this lectureship—Barrows, Fairbairn, Hall, and Henderson. It is plainly evident that the present lecturer is a spokesman for the younger generation: that was, I must believe, the intention of the Barrows trustees in making the appointment. But as my own work has lain for nearly fifteen years in the very shadow of one great American university, and during the last ten years has taken me into not less than forty other colleges and universities in all parts of America, from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, I can at least tell you, as Indian students, something of what is in the minds and hearts of your American fellow-students as they face the great social and spiritual problems of our generation.

I am struck to find, on this journey nearly halfway round the world, how many of the same

thoughts and feelings are stirring in the younger generation, and especially among the students, of every land I have visited. As our steamer from Egypt to India headed east under one flaming sunset I was talking at length with an Indian student who had just taken a degree in business administration after more than three years' study in New York City. "Of course," he said, "business is my chosen profession; but what I care most about as I come back to my own country is using my profession as a means by which I can serve India." How quickly I recognized that note, so characteristic of the younger generation, as I have myself heard it in personal talks with scores of students. Not only American students, but also, and even more markedly, the Chinese students in America, are striking it constantly. Back of it is the intuitive sense that a new China, a new America, a new India, a new world, is in the making in these critical years—and the eager desire to take a worthy part in their making.

I was reminded again, under that Indian sunset, of a beautiful story about William H. Baldwin, Jr., the young president of the Long Island Railroad in the days when the tunnels under the Hudson and East Rivers into New York City were being built. A neighbor of his remarked as they were

crossing the ferry one morning on their way to work, "Won't it be fine to live in New York when the tunnels are finished, and we can ride right into the city by train?" "Yes," said Mr. Baldwin, "I suppose it will. But I, for my part, would far rather live in New York now, while the tunnels are being built, and have my part in the making of them." That was the authentic voice of youth in every generation, and in none more characteristic than in our own. They in whose hearts that voice finds eager echo are young in spirit, whether their calendar years be few or many. To all such in the East, on behalf of their spiritual contemporaries in the West, these lectures are addressed.

The building of these new nations and this new world will be a task far more prolonged and difficult than the construction of any tunnels. There are ignorances and prejudices, rivalries and conflicts of interest, misunderstandings and suspicions and bitternesses, separating group from group and nation from nation, that are at least as hard to penetrate as any wall of rock. And human nature itself seems sometimes as unstable and shifting a medium in which to work as any bed of sand. Moreover, we know far more about the technique of tunnels than we do as yet about the art of building a better world; so fast and far has mechanical engi-

neering outrun social and spiritual construction, and so much easier is it. But it is at least encouraging that there are so many men of good will in many lands, stretching out hands and minds and hearts to each other across the gaps and gulfs that divide our world, and seeking to learn together the fine art of human co-operation. The number of such seems on the whole to increase with each generation, especially among its youth; and it was never larger than among the students of the world at the present time.

It is such mutual understanding and interchange between East and West in matters religious that the Barrows Lectures were founded to promote. The "friendly, temperate, and conciliatory way" . . . . and "fraternal spirit" so finely described by Mrs. Haskell in a memorable sentence of her letter of gift more than thirty years ago were rarer then in religious affairs than, happily, they are today. My four distinguished predecessors in this lectureship, coming from West to East, have done much to promote them. But during these thirty years the tide of spiritual influence and interchange has by no means flowed only one way. It was the deep impression made by Swami Vivekananda as the leading representative of Hinduism at the World's Parliament of Religions in Chicago

in 1893 that immediately preceded the foundation of these lectures. The concrete suggestion came to Mrs. Haskell, as she has herself told us, from Mr. P. C. Mozoomdar, of India. While the Barrows lecturers have been visiting the East, Rabindranath Tagore has been lecturing and reading in the West, and his writings have gone far, wide, and deep. I well remember across the years the evening when I heard him read from his own works to a great audience in Chicago. I had to wait my turn to secure his latest novel from the University Club library there last spring. And I never shall forget the remark of one of our own greatest religious leaders as he presented me, ten years ago, with the copy of *Gitanjali* which I have since learned to love—"I wonder if this is not the great God-consciousness of our generation." He could not then have foreseen that India would so quickly give yet another great God-consciousness to the world. America knows very little about Indian political issues, and is therefore hardly in a position to pass intelligent judgment upon them. But there is the keenest interest—an interest clearly reflected in our best magazines, such as the *Atlantic Monthly*, and equally at every great university center—in Mahatma Gandhi as a moral and spiritual leader. Our younger generation,

especially, is more and more coming to regard him as one of the very greatest religious personalities of our time.

How the farsighted founder of these lectures would have rejoiced in all these indications of a better mutual understanding between East and West in the things of the spirit, and how eagerly she would have hoped that in the years to come we may draw closer yet!

In this first lecture I would direct your thought more especially to the two great spiritual needs which the last ten years—the years during and since the Great War—have disclosed to thoughtful men everywhere as the supreme spiritual needs of all mankind alike. The first of these is the need for spiritual guidance. Just what I mean by that I can perhaps best tell you in a figure.

Every schoolboy knows that Niagara Falls is one of the great natural wonders of America; and most of you have doubtless wished that you might sometime see for yourselves that tremendous spectacle. The overflow of four great lakes, each as large as an inland sea, hurls itself there incessantly over a curving wall of rock hundreds of yards wide and nearly two hundred feet high with a roar like unceasing thunder, and a spray that

blows in drifting white clouds high above the crest. The water rushes over, broken gray; in mid-stream it is deep enough to appear clear green. In winter the river brings down huge cakes of ice that lift and fling themselves over the edge into the abyss below; but the sound of their crash cannot be heard above the roar of the torrent.

Just below the Falls the river settles down quickly enough on its new level, smooth and dark. A little steamer, the "Maid of the Mist," carries visitors up into the spray for a close view of the Falls from below. But this apparent quiet is not for long. Within a scant mile the stream enters the narrow gorge of the Niagara Rapids, and for miles thereafter it is tossed and torn again into wild white fury. Great cakes of ice are flung about in winter like sticks of wood, and no boat could ever live through that long riot of angry water. Even when, far down the gorge, the river runs out smooth and green and deep again, there come eddying up from its hidden depths great whirlpools of water that twist themselves about for a hundred yards, and then disappear as suddenly and mysteriously as they came. The observer from the shore is puzzled for the moment as to the direction of the main stream because of the back-current of these eddies.

Our own generation has passed through a social and spiritual experience that is not unlike all this. The world of 1914 was flung almost without warning over the sudden precipice of the Great War. When, after four long years of uproar and agony, November 11, 1918, came at last, we all expected that life would soon settle down quietly again on the new post-war level. Our own President Harding coined the phrase "back to normalcy" for that delusive hope. We know now that after so tragic and prolonged a disturbance no such quick quiet was humanly possible. Like the Niagara River, our generation has run rapidly on into years of confusion and turbulence that have made this post-war period a dangerous and difficult time the world around. And even when things have seemed to begin to settle down once more, there have surged up from the depths of the human heart and of the public mind sudden whirlpools of emotion and impulse that have not only perplexed us as to the direction of the main current, but have caught us helpless in their strong back-eddy: suspicions and fears and hates between nations and races, new ambitions and aspirations within classes and colors and countries, new forces loose in a swiftly changing world that neither prophets nor statesmen can calculate, much less control. The

youngest of us will spend our whole lives in a world still trying to steer its difficult way amid the rapids and the whirlpools that stretch far below the Niagara Falls of the Great War.

It is not simply the social experience of our generation, however, that has been thus convulsed and confused. Its intellectual life has passed through a period and a process hardly less revolutionary. President Burton of the University of Chicago has remarked to his students and friends that probably no generation in human history has ever had to readjust its thinking to so many new facts from so many different quarters in so short a space of time, as have the men and women who have been alive during the last half-century, and have tried to keep in touch with what mankind is finding out. Not simply the natural sciences that have so vastly extended and so radically altered our conceptions of the physical universe about us and of the history of life upon this planet, but hardly less the social sciences, with their new knowledge of human origins, history, literature, and interactions, have carried the intellectual life of mankind to a new level within our own lifetime. On that new level the best thinking of our own generation must be done; for whether we like it or not, we cannot go back above the falls to the tight

little earth-centered universe, the brief and brightly lighted historical background, the uncritical conceptions and assumptions of an earlier day. The new physics, the new historical method, the new sociology, the new comparative religion, and now, not least, the new psychology, have poured upon us a mingled flood of facts, probabilities, and possibilities that has swept us inexorably into one of the most rapid and confused periods of intellectual transition in all human experience. Just where, when, or how we shall come out no thoughtful man can foresee.

Now there is no group or class among us on whom these influences and perplexities fall with such sudden and tremendous force as upon serious-minded students of college age and grade. They have but just come over that precipice in both thinking and experience that always lies somewhere between childhood and real maturity. The things that many of them were taught and took for granted as children, back there above the falls, no longer pass unquestioned in this new world of the critical and exploring mind in which they must henceforth live. Only less than their elders, who took some personal part in the Great War, have they felt the force of the powerful current of disillusionment which, after these years of high hopes

and bitter disappointments since 1918, has carried so many of the most sensitive-souled folk of this generation into some backwater of cynicism. And in the midst of all this mental and spiritual confusion there come surging up within their own hearts, like the sudden eddies in the Niagara River below the falls, new impulses, new emotions, new aspirations: the strong passions that provide so many problems for our human nature, and yet, close alongside these, the high idealism and altruism and spirituality that are equally part of our human endowment. Every young man, especially, knows in his own heart something of this bewildering rush of rapid and whirlpool; the *Sturm und Drang* through which youth must always pass, complicated and reinforced by all the cross-currents that confuse and agitate our own generation. Is it any wonder that he is uncertain sometimes about his own inner life—which is the eddy, and which the main stream? Or is it strange that so many observers of "this younger generation," standing on the bank as it rushes past, should sometimes in their natural anxiety see chiefly the eddies, and miss the deeper current that includes and bears them on?

Every boatman knows that in quick water it is dangerous, if not fatal, to drift; the swift current

will bear him onward fast enough, but it may equally fling him on a rock or upset him in a rapid. Only a quick eye for the deep water, a firm hand to push into it, and a stout heart that does not lose its courage and confidence, will bring him safely through. This has been pointed out a thousand times to individual young men in the quick water of youth. They will not win through to real manhood simply by drifting with the current: that may mean shipwreck, as everyone knows. But not everyone sees that all this is no less true of a generation, like our own, that is passing through some of the quickest water in all human experience. The one thing we must not do in difficult and critical days like these is to drift.

In a recent sermon at the Royal Exchange in London that picturesque and original figure among British preachers, Rev. G. A. Studdert-Kennedy, put this familiar truth with great vividness into the terms of our own time:

> Anything is better than wobbling. People say that we can drift into peace. You will neither drift into peace nor into victory; you will drift into hell.
>
> If we are going to make peace, then we must pursue peace with the same tremendous earnestness, with the same steadfastness of purpose, with the same unconquerable hope and faith that we pursued victory in the war. We cannot drift into peace; it is going to be the most tremendous and supreme effort

of the human race; and if you just let things slide, act neither upon one faith nor upon the other, pursue a policy of pinpricks because you do not know how to wield a sword, and you dare not walk without one—if you wobble and waver through the world, you will come to disaster. Either you must make justice and reason the basis of your entire constitution all over the world, seeking justice for the black man as for the white man, and appealing to reason and appealing to what is right; or, for God's sake, buckle on your sword, and use it as your fathers did, without wavering.

There are two reasons why a generation like our own cannot drift in days like these without risk of disaster. One is that the river we are descending is full, not only of rocks and rapids that everybody can see, but of ice-cakes that have come over the falls from a bygone winter, and are hardly less dangerous to successful navigation. Barely ten years ago the Allied world went to war to "smash Prussian militarism" as the great enemy of democracy. But one cannot stay long, these post-war days, in any Allied country without coming upon huge cakes of the militaristic state of mind, that has "learned nothing and forgotten nothing" since 1914, and that imperils civilization itself no less than it imperils democracy. We westerners used to think that religious intolerance and bitterness had passed from among us with the Middle Ages: but our post-war world is suddenly

full of it again. The non-Teutonic world bitterly resented the swaggering conceit of Germanic *Kultur* and its arrogant claim to world-domination ten years ago, and smiled at the supposedly scientific arguments for its racial and cultural superiority that were learnedly marshaled by its exponents. Today the Anglo-Saxon world is full of earnest and excited folk talking in very much the same fashion about "Nordic superiority." The language has changed since the war, but the state of mind is still with us, and dangerous as ever to the peace and progress of humanity.

But the deeper danger is the uncertainty of our own minds and hearts about our ultimate goals and ideals. Our generation is drifting, chiefly because it is inwardly divided as to which course it really wants to steer. As Mr. Studdert-Kennedy points out, two channels are plainly opening out ahead of us. One looks, at first sight, wider and easier, and the strong men and strong nations have almost always followed it. "Every man for himself, and the devil take the hindermost"—

> He may take who has the power,
> And he may keep who can.

Nor are there lacking loud voices in our own time to insist that this is the only course for "two-fisted

he-men," and nations that would be great, to steer. One of our Chicago dailies that, with a self-assurance rather unusual even in America, calls itself at the top of its first page "the world's greatest newspaper," prints every day at the head of its editorial page the slogan of its noisy patriotism, "My country, right or wrong." And an eminent British public man, in an academic address that has echoed round the world, has recently declared that still, as of old, there are glittering prizes to be won by those nations that keep their swords sharp and ready.

Voices like these find quick and resonant echo from some of the elemental instincts of our own very human hearts and some of the old traditions of our national life. But somehow, in spite of these incitements without and within, we hesitate. More and more clearly, amid all the shouting, we hear from the bank a warning voice that this wide and easy and much-traveled way is one of several such that lead to destruction. Those who have looked far enough downstream to study the fate of our predecessors report more and more decisively that this prophetic warning has been sadly borne out by human history and experience. "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Besides, whether from too much conscience or too

little nerve, we cannot quite bring ourselves any longer to be entirely ruthless, either with our swords or our fists, or altogether heartless about the fate of the hindermost. We have been hearing too long that voice from the bank, and it, no less than the other, has found too many echoes in our own deepest hearts.

And so, in our inner hesitancy, we drift. The warning voice comes again, that this too is dangerous: "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon." It bids us look for another channel: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." But it warns us that this other course will not be easy to find, and very hard to follow: "Straight is the gate, and narrow is the way, that leadeth unto life; and few there be that find it." The more we look this other way, the greater the difficulties and risks appear, until our hearts fail us for our little faith. With these two channels before us—the one broad, alluring, but dangerous; the other narrow, risky, and difficult—we drift on still, uncertain which way to steer. Our urgent need is for decisive spiritual guidance. The hymn that some of us learned to sing as children by the seashore begins to take on a new and deeper contemporary meaning:

Jesus, Saviour, pilot me
Over life's tempestuous sea;
Unknown waves before me roll,
Hiding rock and treacherous shoal;
Chart and compass came from Thee:
Jesus, Saviour, pilot me.

If this be a recognizable picture of our present situation, it becomes at once evident that even deeper and greater than our need for guidance is our need for spiritual power. With such real dangers and such great possibilities before us, what we lack is the decisive conviction to turn our backs on the easier course, and the courageous and creative faith to seek out the narrow way. In a world where men almost always know much more and much better than they do, the ultimate spiritual problem is usually one of dynamic; and this is notably true of our own sophisticated and disillusioned generation. Partly we lack accurate knowledge to guide us; still more we lack creative faith to inspire us.

Among my neighbors and friends at the University of Chicago are some of the world's most eminent physicists, geologists, and astronomers. From them I have picked up, bit by bit, a layman's cursory acquaintance with what seems to them at present the most probable scientific hypothesis as to the process by which our world was made and our solar system organized. Long aeons ago, as

our flaming sun wandered through space—God alone knows whence or whither—it came within range of loose and scattered masses of spiral nebulae—"star-stuff," thin, incoherent, anarchic. As it marched on past, its attractive power gripped these scattered masses, drew them after itself, welded them together, and built them up into planets, and swung them about itself in the orderly and dependable orbit of our present solar system. So orderly is that system that by it we set our watches, reckon our years, and calculate the shadow of a solar eclipse centuries ahead to the minute and the mile. Great Jupiter never interferes with little Mercury, nor need little Mercury fear great Jupiter; each has its own place and plays its own part in the celestial harmony.

It is some such organizing principle and energizing power that is the supreme spiritual need of our personal lives and our common life in difficult days like these. Our own personalities are for the most part disorganized and incoherent as the spiral nebulae: "soul-stuff," drifting aimless at the whim of impulse or the beck of fashion. "The hero," said Emerson, "is the man who is immovably centered." But lacking such spiritual coherence and consolidation, divided against ourselves by conflicting desires, with no central loyalty to

dominate them, we neither bulk very large nor move very dependably. Even more obviously is this our great social need. On what principle, around what center, can human life be so organized as to save it from confusion and disorder, and built up into an orderly system in which each group and class and race and nation can add to its own weight and value, while at the same time it keeps its place dependably in the whole co-operative relationship? It is that central organizing principle for which our post-war world is seeking, without which it must drift in continual danger of falling back into "chaos and old night."

It is, at least, reasonably clear since 1914 that some organizing principles on which men have long relied cannot adequately provide this dynamic. Superior force cannot do it. Force may dominate in a collision, but the result will inevitably be a smash-up, not a system. The constant tendency of superior force, as our modern world has learned to its terrific cost, is to call forth counter-force to resist it. The resulting "balance of power" is a most precarious and unstable equilibrium, with a disaster whenever it is upset. Nor can self-interest supply that principle, as R. H. Tawney has so convincingly shown in his study of *An Acquisitive Society*. It can draw weaker bodies helplessly

into its train, and flash brilliant for a day like a comet in the sky; but its ultimate spiritual destiny is the outer darkness, for it has learned neither to obey nor to serve. It makes shooting stars, not systems. And competition cannot provide that principle. It can stimulate a short race where someone is strong and impartial enough to maintain fair conditions; but in large matters its usual outcome is well described by your own Indian proverb about the one big fish with all the smaller fishes inside. That is hardly a system. Only half-consciously as yet, perhaps, but none the less urgently, our modern world is groping for a source of spiritual dynamic adequate for the personal and social demands of the future—a dynamic which neither force nor self-interest nor competition can sufficiently supply.

Now it is one of the deeply significant facts of our time, to which I ask your attention finally today, that in their search for this spiritual guidance and power, the minds and hearts of thoughtful men in many lands, regardless of race and creed, are turning afresh to Jesus of Nazareth. Because I do not want to ask you to take my own unsupported assertion in this matter, I shall bring you some striking first-hand evidence on this point from

leaders of thought the world around, who can hardly be discounted as professional propagandists in any sectarian sense. George Bernard Shaw, that brilliant, heretical Irishman who has not only seen through so many of the shams of modern life, but has been looking of late so deep into some of its ultimate needs, says:

> I am no more a Christian than Pilate was, or you, gentle reader; and yet, like Pilate, I greatly prefer Jesus to Annas or Caiaphas; and I am ready to admit that, after contemplating the world and human nature for nearly sixty years, I see no way out of the world's misery but the way which would have been found by Christ's will, if he had undertaken the work of a modern practical statesman.

And again:

> Though we crucified Christ on a stick, he somehow managed to get hold of the right end of it, and . . . . if we were better men, we might try his plan.

And you remember Shaw's remark that the only man who came out of the war with an enhanced reputation for common sense was Jesus Christ.

A year ago the editor of the *Indian Social Reformer*, Mr. K. Natarajan, of Bombay, wrote a Christmas editorial that has echoed around the world. I have myself clipped it in quotation from two American periodicals. In that editorial he said:

> More than nineteen hundred years ago Jesus Christ was nailed upon the cross by a Roman governor. The orthodox

Jews who instigated Pilate to commit this infamous crime were no doubt satisfied that the great movement which Christ had set on foot had failed. Failed! It was Roman justice that had failed. It was Jewish bigotry that had failed. An empire which has ceased to heed the voice of justice and humanity in the pursuit of its selfish interests which are always ephemeral is like a tree, rotten, and awaiting the first passing blast to come to the ground. The Roman empire fell, and upon its ruins the Church of Christ rose to a great height of power. And though today Christianity but feebly reflects the spirit of its Master, the personality of the Master himself stands before the world in compelling grandeur.

Never before have so many earnest minds of all races and creeds turned to him for light and guidance in perplexities. The number and insight of new lives of Christ are alone evidence of the fresh and deepened interest in his life and teaching.

Another prominent Hindu recently remarked to Dr. E. Stanley Jones, who told me of it just before I left Chicago to go to India: "There seems to be no one else seriously bidding for the heart of the world except Jesus Christ. There is no one else on the field."

A young Chinese, who had just finished his studies in New York City and was going back to become superintendent of schools in one of the great cities of China, said to Dr. Harry E. Fosdick: "I want Christ, and I want Christ because I want power that I may live a serviceable life

for my people before I fall on sleep." That single sentence speaks for the desires that are deepest in many hearts of the younger generation in other lands as well. Its emphasis is characteristic and significant: Christ, power, service.

From my own land I quote two utterances only out of scores that would be appropriate. One of the most stimulating of younger American thinkers in matters spiritual, Dean W. L. Sperry of Harvard, to whose essays on *The Disciplines of Liberty* these lectures owe a great debt, writes thus on the very first page: "We are living in a world which has all but exhausted the moral possibilities of the dogmas of enlightened self-interest, free competition, paternalism, and kindred nostrums; a world which finds itself driven on by this process of moral elimination to the religion of Jesus." And one of the foremost Canadian-American authorities on the life of Jesus, Professor E. F. Scott, begins his recent book on *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus* thus: "Today, as never before, Jesus stands out as the moral leader of humanity. The principles which he laid down have been vindicated through the bitter experiences of the last few years, and men of all opinions are now agreed that the society of the future can be securely built on no other foundation."

It is easy to find clear echo of these words in the recent utterances of responsible statesmen. During the darkest days of the Great War one of the most eminent of American Jews, Henry Morgenthau, then our ambassador to Turkey, said that he could see no way out for the future except in the principles of Jesus. That same conviction was the deep undertone of the last brief utterance that Woodrow Wilson wrote for publication; and it found even more explicit utterance in the last public address but one of President Harding before his sudden death.

But even more prophetically significant is the utterance which that same conviction is finding among the younger generation, and notably among students, the world around. I have already quoted one such from a Chinese student. Last November, in Jerusalem, in a large gathering of students most of whom were Moslems, I myself heard a young Indian professor who had been sent to represent the Indian Student Movement at a conference near London of the World's Student Christian Federation, say that in the principles of Jesus, taken very seriously and applied over the whole range of human life, is the only real hope of the future for all mankind. I shall never forget either the setting or the significance of that ut-

terance. While I was in London last September a Cambridge undergraduate, speaking before a church congress, declared that his own generation wanted to be very sure that the Christian church itself, with all its traditions and ceremonies and creeds, did not get in the way of their seeing Jesus.

There speaks an authentic voice from the younger generation the world around. It is looking beyond the institutions and creeds and ceremonies that have taken Christ's name—looking through them when it can, past them when it must—for a fresh clear sight of Jesus himself. There is an open-eyed fearlessness and intellectual courage in this attitude which no one who knows the students of today can miss. They are not afraid of all that science and history and philosophy can tell us about the world in which we live; they welcome the clearer light which recent scholarship is giving us, not only on these other matters, but on the figure of Jesus himself. Competent authorities tell us that no previous generation since his day has been in so favorable a position as our own to see and understand him better: that in itself is one of the many influences that are bringing us nearer to him and him nearer to us. But an even larger factor in making possible this new vision of Christ is the spiritual sincerity and earnestness that is impelling

the younger generation to seek it. I understand that when a company of Indian Christians recently called on Mahatma Gandhi to ask for a word of spiritual counsel, he bade them put into practice the teachings of Jesus "in all their rugged simplicity." I am deeply grateful to the great spiritual leader of India for that word of insight and power. Let me put beside it a similar word from one of the great spiritual leaders of the West, who has more influence over American students today in these matters than any other man, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick. He declares that "the high business of taking Jesus seriously" is the most important task of our time.

That is the keynote of these Barrows Lectures: "The high business of taking Jesus seriously," "in all his rugged simplicity." I shall venture to ask those of you who come here these six days to lay aside so far as possible, as I myself shall try to do, the traditions and the preconceptions and, most of all, the misconceptions that may have come between us and him. Let us look past creed and ceremony and civilization and church, all of which only partly deserve his name, straight to Jesus himself. That we also, gathered here together, may see him afresh is my deepest hope and faith and prayer.

LECTURE II

JESUS' WAY OF LIFE

On my way to India I spent four days at Nazareth, in Palestine, the sunny town nestling among the Galilean hills where Jesus grew to manhood. One memorable day we rode down to the shining Lake of Galilee to visit Capernaum, where his public activity as a religious teacher began. There is a very significant sentence in the earliest account of his life, describing the impression which his first appearance there made on his hearers: "They were astonished at his teaching; for he taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes" (Mark 1:22).[1]

The longer one considers that statement, the more surprising it becomes; for among the Jews of that day, the scribes were generally held to be the very channels and vehicles of spiritual authority. We know from many sources what their religious teaching was like. Long centuries before, so they believed, the God of their fathers had revealed his perfect and holy will in the Mosaic law; and

[1] The biblical quotations throughout are taken from the American Revised Version.

through the generations since that law had been elaborated and applied by their wise men with meticulous care. "They counted up its commands, and made them out to be 613 in all." This long series of prohibitions and prescriptions had to be continually interpreted and applied to the new situations and problems that were constantly arising. Among the Jews it was the rabbis, or scholars in this ancient law, who made these applications. Then the scribes learned them and passed them on through the synagogue to the common people. Authority in religious teaching thus consisted in the ability to quote ancient precedents and learned scholars on the interpretation and application of a great and growing mass of detailed rules for conduct.

This process is much easier to understand if we follow it in one or two illustrations. The Ten Commandments of the old Mosaic law had forbidden labor on the Sabbath day. Very good: but what constitutes such labor? The door was at once open for endless casuistry and hair-splitting refinement in the detailed application of this general rule. By the time of Jesus thirty-nine different kinds of work were listed as thus forbidden: the one rule had become thirty-nine, just as the Ten had become 613. Each of these kinds of work

had then, of course, to be defined in detail. Knots, for instance, must not be tied on the Sabbath: this held for sailors' or camel-drivers' knots, but did not apply to knots made by women in fastening their garments or in cooking. Rabbi Meir, who seems to have been very liberal in his views, declared it permissible to tie a knot on the Sabbath provided it could be untied with one hand! Writing on the Sabbath was likewise forbidden. This was construed to mean that two letters of the alphabet must not be written together; but if they were written at different times in the day some rabbis pronounced it blameless, while Rabbi Gamaliel declared it a sin! Sometimes the result was even more humorous. Burdens must not be carried on the Sabbath; but this, said Rabbi Meir with the liberal views, does not forbid a cripple to go out with his wooden leg, since that is a help. No, declared Rabbi Joses, he has broken the Sabbath and sinned, for his wooden leg is a burden!

So endless, sometimes so trivial, mostly so futile, was the whole hair-splitting process of such pure legalism. Inevitably it reduced religion to outward conformity with a formal code, and tended to care less and less for the thoughts and intents of the heart. God was a celestial Bookkeeper, forever noting down and balancing up men's debit and

credit accounts. The religious ideal, in the apt figure of one rabbi, was that of a well-lined cistern or tank that catches and holds every drop of water from the past, but can never itself produce a single drop that is fresh.

Into this atmosphere of dry and dusty legalism came the young carpenter-prophet of Nazareth. His first hearers in Capernaum doubtless knew less about him than we who look back at those early days in the light of all that has happened since: they had never heard or dreamed of his Messiahship, and his healings had hardly begun. Even the substance of his teaching is only scantily and vaguely summarized in these first accounts. But they make abundantly plain the dynamic power of his vivid personality over individuals who almost at a word left family and occupation to follow him. No less evident is the unique impression of spiritual authority made by his teaching upon all that heard it. Men recognized his authority at once as different from, and greater than, that claimed by their other religious teachers, the scribes.

There were evidently two characteristics of Jesus' religious teaching that stood out from the first in sharp contrast with the teaching of the scribes. The first was a certain spiritual freshness

and forthrightness, an inherent convincingness that went straight to the hearts of his hearers and produced there its own assent. Where the scribes relied upon learned quotation from ancient and honorable authorities of "long ago and far away," he spoke confidently and contagiously out of his own deep and fresh personal experience, from heart to heart. "Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, ... but *I* say unto you . . . ." That first person was as characteristic of him as the third person was of the scribes. In his own superb figure, religion was to him, and in him, a spring of living water, bubbling forth fresh each moment for that moment's needs. When he did quote from the law or the prophets of old, it was as if he cleared away the crusted accumulation of the centuries, and set the spring of the spirit freely flowing again. Men who had gathered round the well-lined cistern of the scribes so long as it held all the water they could get, turned eagerly now, as men always will, from the stale cistern to the cool sparkle of the living spring.

These two ways of teaching religion, these two conceptions of what religion itself is, are always with us, in every land and age, and within every one of the great historic faiths of mankind. The more prevalent, but the less valuable, quotes in

the third person, often very learnedly, from ancient book or famous teacher, and rests its claim on the external authority of that quoted source. The rarer, and much the more precious, speaks freshly in the first person from within, and rests its claim on its own self-evidencing appeal, and on the spontaneous response which it evokes in those who have ears to hear. One is a well-lined cistern; the other a living spring. In the fine words of T. R. Glover:

> Jesus looks forward and not backward, and in his teaching, faithfully interpreted in the light of his mind, there is no hint of fear of progress. His religion is not a natter of tradition, of loyalty and obedience to ancient revelation, nor does it impose a system that will in time grow old. The religions of his day were religions of old books; so is Hinduism; so is some Christianity today. His is the religion of the new song.[1]

Nor is it simply in the utterances of others about religion that we can distinguish these two voices. They speak also within our own hearts. Sometimes, especially as students, we try to convince ourselves by philosophic argument and learned authorities that there is a God, and a higher meaning to human life, and a world unseen and eternal beyond this shifting present. We read many books, weigh endless arguments, and balance

[1] *Jesus in the Experience of Men*, p. 142.

what Professor So-and-So thinks against what Professor This-or-That says. Meanwhile our friends and our own hearts no less, listen as did the common people to the scribes, respectful enough, even attentive perhaps, but not quite convinced. And then suddenly the still, small voice of faith and hope and love speaks within our own hearts, witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God, and that it doth not yet appear what we shall be. We, too, are astonished at this teaching; for it speaks as having authority, and not as the scribes. Not without good spiritual reason do your own beautiful *Bhakti Sutras*[1] of Narada say:

> Never reason about God.
> For discussion is endless and futile.
>
> Love is the easiest way,
> For it proves itself and needs no other proof.
> For it is, indeed, peace and bliss.

From all this appears at once the nature of the response which Jesus has always sought from men. He risks all upon the direct and self-evidencing appeal to our own hearts of the truth as he declares it. He does not attempt to build up a case by argument, as a lawyer speaking to a judge or a jury. He speaks rather as would a mother to her child, a friend to his friend, a lover to his

[1] Nos. 74–75, 58–60.

beloved, where everything hangs upon the direct and spontaneous response of soul to soul. Unless that be there, there is nothing—at least nothing of what he cares most about; and if that be there, obedience and discipleship follow as a matter of course. This fundamental characteristic of Jesus' work among men has been finely put by one of our foremost American religious thinkers of the last generation, W. N. Clarke:

> Jesus is not an argumentative teacher. He could not be. How unlike he is to Socrates the convincer! He is the great proclaimer of eternal truth. Accordingly his teaching is morally axiomatic and self-evidencing. He does not defend it. If men reject it, it is not because his reasoning does not convince them; it is because the teaching itself does not appeal to them. Recognition is what it asks, and acceptance as true. Its success consists in winning its way, so that men acknowledge it and give it the place of truth in their life.[1]

A second main characteristic of Jesus' teaching, by which again it was sharply contrasted with that of the scribes of his day, is that it deals, not with rules, but with principles. The religion of his time was, as we have seen, a complicated set of rules for conduct, top-heavy with elaboration as new rules had been developed to meet new situations. But Jesus was no spiritual tinker, giving a new turn or twist to an ancient law in order to fit it to a new

[1] *The Ideal of Jesus*, p. 27.

need. He was a spiritual creator: like a master-architect with a new vision of the Kingdom of God on earth, like a master-musician composing a new song for all mankind to sing, like a master-artist shaping the perfect man, and also the perfect humanity, as God would have them to be. What he gives men is not rules in detail, but fundamental principles, few and simple, but profound: not a system, but an attitude and a spirit. These principles are applicable to every situation in human life: but that application to the concrete case Jesus leaves to the mind and conscience of his followers, as the architect gives over his plans first to his associates to be worked out into detailed drawings, and then to the contractor to be actually built; as the composer turns over his music to the conductor to be orchestrated, scored, and then rendered; as the sculptor turns over his statue to his craftsmen to be cast and polished. Jesus is not seeking to produce moral automata who go through a set of motions according to rules that they have learned by rote; he is a maker of free men who will act under the inner impulse and guidance of his great principles. As Clarke well puts it:

> Jesus . . . . was a maker of manhood. He taught personality to direct itself from within. . . . . This could not be done by rule; it required education of the man. His train-

ing could not take the form of an external discipline; it must be personal, inward, flexible, suggestive, transforming. . . . . He was not a lawgiver, but a revealer, an enlightener, a renewer, an awakener of motives, and a mover of men. It is insufficient even to describe him as a teacher—how much more as a lawgiver! He was an inspirer, a creator of ideals, a deliverer from spiritual limitations, a vivifier of souls, a breather of power to fulfil the ideals that he created.[1]

A clear conception of the difference in religion between rules and principles is so important for any true understanding of Jesus that we may well try to clarify it still further by a very simple illustration. I have a small son in Chicago, six years old, just beginning school. Suppose now, as he is starting out some morning, I give him two rules for the day. I say to him: "My boy, when you cross the street this morning, be sure to look out first for the motor cars. And when you get to school, be sure to study hard, and learn your lessons well." Now those are two very good rules for small schoolboys—at least in Chicago. When he comes home from school, and I ask him whether he has kept my two rules, he answers, "Yes. I looked both ways before I crossed the street, and I studied hard—and see this." He proudly shows me his paper in arithmetic, marked 100. But just as I am about to pat him approvingly, I notice something

[1] Clarke, *op. cit.*, pp. 28–29.

about one of his eyes that he evidently does not want me to see. "Why, what is this? What has happened to you?" With evident embarrassment he explains: "We were all coming home from school, and got to calling each other bad names, and another boy hit me because of what I called him, and we got into a fight, and I got a black eye." My boy has kept my two rules perfectly: but has he been a good boy that day? Hardly. The trouble is that I could not foresee just that situation at school. I gave him no rule for it, and he failed to meet it.

But now suppose that, instead of two rules, I give him at the beginning of the day just one principle, simple but profound. I say to him, "Son, wherever you are today, and whatever happens, be sure to be the very best boy you know how to be." That is a principle, not a rule. Probably he does not know the difference between them yet, but I do; and he will discover the difference as he tries to act on the principle. When he comes to the dangerous crossing, he says to himself: "Father said I must be the best boy I know how—that means I must be very careful here." When he gets to school, "Father said I must be the best boy I know how—that means I must get my arithmetic just right." On the way home, "Father said I must

be the best boy I know how—that means I mustn't call the other fellows bad names." My principle has helped him, not only in the two situations that I did foresee, but even more in the critical one that I could not foresee. In every situation he has had to think for himself as to what the right thing to do is, and to summon up his strength to do it. My principle is teaching my boy to grow up into the kind of man I most want him to be.

So, Jesus always said, does God deal with us, his human children, whom he would have grow up into his own likeness of character; and just so did Jesus himself deal with those who came to him for spiritual guidance. He gave them principles, not rules. Like the true Oriental that he was, like the artist and poet that he was no less, he loved to put his principles with a sharp touch of vividness, and even of paradox. This not only helped men to remember what he said, but also made them think about its deeper meaning. When he was asked once about rules for washing and eating, of which the orthodox Jews of his day made much, he answered with the great principle that spiritual purity depends not upon external contacts, but upon internal attitudes (Mark 7:1–23); but how infinitely more vivid and memorable was his statement of that principle than is mine! Equally

vivid and stirring was his statement of the great principle of moral self-mastery at whatever cost in struggle or pain (Matt. 5:29–30). But if this is to be regarded as a literal rule enjoining self-mutilation where eye or hand has offended, then it would squarely contradict Jesus' own insistence, throughout the same passage, that the root of moral evil lies in the state of the heart.

Equally picturesque, and even more perplexing often to our prosaic western minds, is Jesus' teaching as to the duty of men who have suffered wrongfully. He bids them turn the other cheek to violence, go the second mile with compulsion, yield cloak as well as coat to oppression. As Clarke well says:

> It has usually been assumed that these sayings were rules, or something near to rules, and all the difficulties of literal obedience have sprung at once into sight. . . . . But the matter appears in a different light if we drop the idea of rules and look at the principle that is involved in these directions about retaliation and generosity.

They become then three vivid illustrations of one fundamental principle: that my action toward a wrongdoer must not be determined by what he may have done to me, but by a higher attitude and spirit, from which I refuse to let him drag me down to his level. That principle, difficult as it certainly

is to put in practice, because the magnanimity it calls for is so rare, then appears at once not only as the ideal toward which our best modern penology is striving in its treatment of criminals, but also as the attitude which every worthy parent or teacher must take in the training of children. It appears more and more plainly, too, in our modern experience, as the only basis on which wrongs done by man to man, group to group, and nation to nation, can be transcended and left behind. Only so can wounds be permanently healed instead of incessantly reopened, and only so can human life be redeemed from an endless cycle of revenge to its higher potentialities of co-operation and peace. Men of equal intelligence and good will may, and do, sincerely differ as to whether these famous sayings of Jesus constitute a binding rule of absolute non-resistance to evil under any and all circumstances. But there can be no question that he has here laid down the only principle, and inculcated the only spirit, by which human life can be lifted to higher levels and can overcome its earlier evil, not with more evil, but with good. It is, unfortunately, far easier for all of us to debate what Jesus meant in a hypothetical case than to do what he said—and himself did—in the actual situation.

The same genius for simplicity and vividness of statement that has given such edge and point to these sayings, lies back of Jesus' constant use of parable. He knew what any religious teacher soon discovers, that the declaration of principles in the abstract, however high or admirable they may be, produces all too little actual effect on the conduct of our well-meaning but fickle human nature. We assent with our minds—with our hearts, even—but our wills go their own wayward course as before. Both as a teacher and as a mover of men Jesus saw that abstract principles need concrete illustration to make them vivid and compelling. A lawyer asked him once who his neighbor was. Jesus replied, not with a definition, but with an illustration, in the story of the Good Samaritan; and that story has become not only one of the best-known parables in all literature, but perhaps the most powerful appeal for neighborliness in history.

These parables also, like Jesus' shorter sayings, give us principles, not rules. As Professor E. F. Scott well puts it:

> One reason why he adopted this mode of teaching was doubtless that he could thus seize the popular attention and make his thought clear and interesting and real. But his parabolic method also proves that his object was not to frame laws, but to assert vital principles. From most of the parables

it is impossible to extract any formal rule of conduct. If you meet a wounded man by the roadside you will probably help him little if you try to follow in every detail the methods of the Good Samaritan. The parable is spoken, and so are all the others, to enforce a principle. You must show kindness to those in need, and this is how one man did it, and opportunities will come to you every day when you may do likewise.[1]

What now are Jesus' fundamental principles, on which he would base and organize human life? In raising this ultimate question we must remember at once that Jesus never organized his teaching into an ordered system, either ethical or theological. We shall, therefore, seek in vain for any systematic formulation on his own part. But once upon a time a scribe asked him which he considered the most important of the many rules in the ancient law, and his immortal answer gives us the clue we are seeking (Matt. 22:34–40). Characteristically, he did not pick one rule out of the many, but gathered them all up in one fundamental principle with a double application. This principle directs our attention at one and the same time to God above us and to other men around us, and bids us love them both. On this principle, Jesus says, the law and the prophets alike depend. It is therefore for him the sum of ethics and religion,

[1] *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, p. 28.

which are for him inseparably one: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind . . . . and . . . . thy neighbor as thyself."

Jesus' world, in other words, is the world of persons in their relations with each other. For him all the supreme and primary values of life lie in this realm of personalities and their relationships. Things, wealth, power, are always of secondary and derived importance, valuable so far as they are used to further right personal relationships—as he himself suggested, in the parable of the Unjust Steward, that they might be used—but dangerous and even fatal when they shut men off from their fellows in lack of sympathy or excess of envy, or shut men off from God in pride and self-sufficiency. Jesus was plainly no ascetic in his attitude toward the "good things of life" as such; but he was ruthlessly explicit and terribly in earnest about the extreme difficulty and danger involved in keeping these things as means toward higher ends, when they so easily become ends in themselves. No wonder that our modern world, especially in the West, is half puzzled, and half dull of hearing, toward Jesus' outspokenness on this sensitive point.

For to Jesus the supreme values of life all in-

here in persons and their relationships as God would have them in his Kingdom—that new and better order of things wherein his will is fully done. Every single human being, no matter what his race, property, knowledge, or past history, Jesus declares to have infinite value in God's sight. Every human being ought therefore to have similar significance in all men's actions. This infinite value of every human soul Jesus was constantly emphasizing: now by comparison with the lower animals, or with religious institutions such as the Sabbath or the temple, again by such parables as those of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Prodigal Son; once more by such sayings as "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" So God estimates all men for their own sake, and so men ought to regard each other.

It may be helpful to represent Jesus' view of human life by the crude symbol of a triangle, the apex of which stands for God, and the other two points for ourselves and for other people. His purpose and program is to link all three of these points up together in intimate and affectionate relationship. He warns us sharply against all those things in human life that come in between ourselves and our fellows, or between ourselves and God, to isolate and cut us off from spiritual fellow-

ship with men about us and God above us. That fellowship, beginning here and now and continuing hereafter, constitutes membership in the Kingdom of God, and is "life eternal." Wealth may thus isolate us from it, and sin always does. But neither these nor the man they have thus cut off are wholly beyond the reach of God's love and power to reclaim, if a man on his part change his mind and attitude and seek once more at any cost his part and place in the fellowship human and divine. To seek and to save those who are thus "lost" to God and their fellows, and to establish this spiritual fellowship and new order on earth, was Jesus' own divine mission.

What, now, is the attitude that Jesus would have to exist throughout this fellowship, linking men with each other and with God? It is to be the same attitude all around the triangle, the sum of social duty as of religious experience, the tie binding all persons together, love. Our modern world, eager for unhackneyed and unpretentious words, speaks often of helpfulness, service, good will. But Jesus' own word is larger and goes deeper, because, including all these, it brings out the spontaneous, outgoing, creative element that was so characteristic both of his teaching and his life. Nor did Jesus fail to discriminate between the different

levels on which love may move. President Burton of the University of Chicago, himself one of the scholars who has done most to interpret Jesus to our own generation, has pointed out that love always involves appreciation—recognition of the supreme worth of the loved one; that it includes desire for possession, but may degenerate into infatuation, jealousy, or even lust, where this element becomes predominant; and that it rises to its highest level in the consecration and service which stop not at sacrifice on behalf of the one beloved. It is on this last and highest level that love, as Jesus knows it, always moves. In the fine words of Clarke:

> Love has received various definitions in the speech of men, corresponding to their various experiences with it. Sometimes it has been a sentiment of the mind, and sometimes a selfish human desiring; sometimes an ardent approval, or a hunger for possession, or a fellowship of the heart; sometimes a passion of delight. But he who has set love in the highest place has defined it at the highest, showing us that at heart it is a passion for doing good, a self-forgetful impulse of redemption, in imitation of God and fellowship with him. This, which is the passion of God, is appointed to be the passion of his children. This is his ideal of human character. When this ideal is realized the finest ethical grace becomes the very life-breath of religion, while divine religion is the breath of the finest ethical life in man.[1]

[1] *The Ideal of Jesus*, pp. 138–39.

This fundamental attitude, as Jesus would have it govern our social relations with other men around us, he has stated in what is familiarly known as the Golden Rule: "All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them; for this is the law and the prophets" (Matt. 7:12). It is clear at once that this is not a detailed rule specifying a course of conduct for a particular case, but a general principle of conduct, to be applied by his followers themselves in all cases. We notice also that Jesus does not claim originality for this great social principle. He declares it "the law and the prophets"—the sum, that is, of Hebrew ethics and religion. We know now that Buddha, Confucius, and others of humanity's great moral teachers have likewise formulated it. But Jesus is one of the few—Confucius is another—who have extended it from the negative form of prohibition, "Do not unto others what you would not have them do to you," to the far deeper and more difficult positive injunction, "Do unto others. . . . ."

And therewith we come upon one of the most profound and characteristic elements in the ethical and social teaching of Jesus. Here, he tells us, are other people and ourselves, on the same level (as our triangle would represent it) of equal value in

God's sight, and of equal claims on each other; it should be noted that Jesus, who is no ascetic or fanatic, asserts our own value to ourselves and to God as no less than that of others. In Kantian phrase, we are all of us alike ends as persons; none of us simply means. Between others and ourselves there should therefore exist a reciprocity of relations, a mutual give and take. Now our modern world leaps upon this reciprocity of the Golden Rule and claims it as a reciprocity of rights; others must give me my rights, and I will then give them theirs. This emphasis upon human rights has been characteristic of the social thinking, and has inspired much of the social progress, of the last two centuries; but it is not the chief emphasis of Jesus, nor does it go so deeply as he. "To him duties, not rights, were of first importance. Not 'What can I claim?' but 'What do I owe?' is the first question for a right mind to ask. It was characteristic of Jesus that he inspired men to do justice before he moved them to demand it."[1]

This is one reason why our modern cry for social justice, though it is certainly implicit in Jesus' teaching as to the infinite value of every individual, does not sound louder and bulk larger upon his lips. What is explicit and emphatic is his

[1] Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

call to social duties; for when men are intent on doing their full duty by each other, each will in that reciprocity receive his rights, and all will have justice. When men aim at justice alone, however accurate their eye, there is not always strength enough in their arm to reach the target, save with the single arrow of their own individual rights: only the motive of love which Jesus relied on can reach the target of justice with every arrow of each individual's welfare; and it does this by daring to aim beyond justice—at service.

All such study of Jesus' teaching, however, has not yet reached the deeper secrets of his significance and power over men. They were touched much more nearly by a Madras student, himself not a Christian, who recently acknowledged the gift of a New Testament with the penetrating words, "I am grateful for the story of a man who practiced what he preached." Jesus has given to the world one thing more original and valuable even than his teaching—and that is his own life. We were saying just now that Jesus turns over his fundamental principles to us to be applied in the actual situation, somewhat as an architect turns over his plans, a composer his music, or a sculptor his statue, to others to carry out. But there was certainly one thing that he did not turn over to

anybody to complete, and that was his own living. Of that his own last words might fairly be used—"It is finished"—and he finished it himself. He translated his own teachings into a life so perfect in its consistency and so flawless in its detail that the centuries since, like Pilate who tried him, have said with one voice, "We find no fault in this man." That life of his, the perfect illustration and embodiment of his principles, is his supreme gift to mankind.

This is at least one reason why, to so many of the younger generation the world around, the best statement that can be given of what they understand the Christian religion essentially to be seems simply this: Jesus' way of living. The abstract definitions and principles which we laboriously expound as the fundamentals of his teaching are true enough, but they somehow lack the thrill and challenge and power that he gives to them in action. It is a very significant fact that the word "Christlike" is one of the hardest words in the English language to define accurately or adequately; but any man who has once read the four gospels knows pretty well what it means. So far does life always outrun thought and speech—and outweigh them. As Tennyson, and now again Principal Jacks, have pointed out, religion be-

came in Jesus no longer simply a word, but a deed.

> And so the Word had breath, and wrought
> With human hands the creed of creeds
> In loveliness of perfect deeds,
> More strong than all poetic thought.

It is this great fact which makes Jesus himself, rather than any creed or doctrine whatsoever, or any institution, even though it bear his name, the real center and substance of the Christian religion. He is himself the incarnation of all that he taught, and of all that is vital in what his followers believe. What they call the Incarnation thus becomes not simply a theological doctrine about his person; it is also the psychological and historical secret of his spiritual power. If you would know what essential Christianity is, you must not look at our creeds, our churches, our civilization, or ourselves; for neither we nor anything we have made is worthy to represent him. Only he can show you what his religion really is. Look at him!

LECTURE III

JESUS' LIFE WITH GOD

When we Americans visit Britain for the first time, crossing from our own new and half-occupied country to a very old and well-settled one, we naturally expect that our first impressions will be those of its antiquity—some picturesque old castle perhaps, or timbered houses and thatched cottages built long ago. But when some of us first landed in Liverpool or Plymouth, what struck us almost in the face, flooding our eyes and hearts with beauty, was the verdant luxuriance of the English countryside. The meadows were so rich and soft that the sheep and even the cattle seemed to stand knee-deep in greenness, and the trees were so draped and weighted with foliage as to divide and inclose the meadows like a continuous living wall. Then, just as we began to ask why England should be so much more luxuriantly green than our own not infertile homeland, the southwest wind swept up a sudden shower from the Atlantic, and scattered it through the very midst of the sunshine—and we had our answer. The secret of

that fertility and beauty is the English climate—unobtrusive perhaps at first sight, but familiar enough on longer acquaintance—that keeps the countryside fresh and green the whole year round with abundant and continual moisture.

So is it with the character of Jesus. All the centuries since have marveled at its richness and its beauty, its harmonious combination of qualities that in other men tend to fall apart and become mutually exclusive. It has been well said that a man is great in proportion as he is able to unite within himself characteristics that in lesser men seem opposed or even inconsistent; and Dr. G. A. Johnston Ross has worked out that insight with great suggestiveness in his study of *The Universality of Jesus*. We usually think of certain typically masculine qualities such as initiative, courage, endurance, strength, and certain characteristically feminine traits such as patience, sympathy, intuitiveness, tenderness, as thus antithetical. But Jesus united them both in himself. We know some folk possessed of a stern moral rigor and an exacting conscience, but most of us would prefer to live with mates more human and tolerant, and of a quicker sense of humor and understanding. Jesus was morally as uncompromising as man could ever be, and yet at the same time he was

so winsome that little children loved him, and men and women who were sinners found forgiveness and peace in his presence. Jesus had more achieving faith in God's power than our mightiest men of action, but he had no less supply of quiet and humble submission to God's mysterious and holy will. The full secret of this greatest soul that ever came to earth, even more than the secret of our own fractional personalities, is hidden in mystery with the God whom religion believes to be our Creator. But some small part, at least, of that secret, may be found in the spiritual climate of Jesus' way of life. As inconspicuous at first sight as the English moisture, but even more constant and transforming, was the atmosphere of unbroken communion with God in which he lived and moved and had his being.

Those same earliest accounts that tell us so much about Jesus' methods and characteristics as a religious teacher reveal also a remarkable balance and rhythm in his personal life between his practical activities in service to needy men and women about him, and his devotional fellowship with God. There seems to have been in his way of living an alternation almost as regular and quite as indispensable as that which most men find necessary between the day's work and the night's rest and

"re-creation." So Jesus balanced social service to men and personal communion with God as if they were spiritual "outgo" and "intake." After the strenuous Sabbath of his first appearance in Capernaum, when he not only taught in the synagogue, but visited in Peter's home and healed many sick, Mark tells us (1:35) that next morning, "a great while before day, he rose up and went out, and departed into a desert place, and there prayed." The same significant habit shows itself in Mark's record (6:30–46) of another exhausting day when Jesus both taught and fed a great multitude.

It is Luke among his biographers, however, who seems to have had a special sense for the significance of the close connection between Jesus' habit of prayer and many of the great experiences of his life. Jesus was praying, Luke tells us, not only during his baptism (3:21) and transfiguration (9:28–29), but at his arrest (22:45–47) and with his last dying breath (23:46). He spent a whole night in prayer before he chose his twelve intimates (6:12–13), went apart for prayer before he began with them the crucial conversation about his own mission (9:18), and received the report of their successful labors in his name with a prayer of thanksgiving (10:21). To Luke we owe the invaluable hint that the Lord's Prayer (the one religious act,

I am told, in which all the delegates to the World's Parliament of Religions at Chicago in 1893 found that they could join) was born out of Jesus' own actual praying, in answer to the request of his disciples that he help them to pray as they had just seen him pray. The Lord's Prayer, in other words, is no self-conscious composition such as we moderns sometimes laboriously produce when we sit down as individuals to "write a prayer," or as a committee to "enrich our devotional literature." It is rather a living flame kindled on the altar of Jesus' own soul in the presence of his Father, and given us thence to light and warm our dim devotion. Through the long centuries that kindling flame still burns and shines.

To you of India, with your native genius for meditation and communion with the Unseen, this aspect of Jesus' way of life must surely come with special appeal and congeniality. My beloved predecessor in this lectureship, Dr. C. C. Hall, memorably declared and, in his lectures on "Christ and the Eastern Soul," confidently predicted that you would help us matter-of-fact Westerners to understand and share it more fully. We, on the other hand, with our practical bent and energetic activism, are much taken up just now with the ethical and social aspects of Jesus' teaching; within

this general field lay the last Barrows Lectures by Dr. C. R. Henderson on "Social Programmes in the West." Dean Sperry of Harvard University has shrewdly and wittily remarked that our favorite American text from the life of Jesus is that he "went about doing good"—with special emphasis on the going about!

So partial and limited is our view and experience of life that all of us, whether as individuals or as races, tend to specialize and confine ourselves too exclusively to one side or the other of that rich and full-orbed life which Jesus himself lived. In the rough symbolism of our triangle, communion with God is one side of religion; but it is not all of religion by any means, and whoever makes it so is to that extent "one-sided." Just so ethics and social service constitute for Jesus one indispensable side of religion, but by no means all of it: and whoever knows nothing else is similarly "one-sided." Just before I left America for India a professor of Sanskrit, who is one of the truest friends and lovers that India has in America, said to me that after a recent year spent in India he came away feeling that her great spiritual problem was that of relating her mystical genius to her urgent social tasks. That problem is by no means limited to India. In varying terms and forms, as we saw in the first

lecture, it is a central spiritual problem of all modern life. Where else can any of us find such light and help on it as from him in whose own way of life these two aspects of religion found such perfect balance and mutual reinforcement?

O Master, let me walk with Thee
In lowly paths of service free;
Tell me Thy secret; help me bear
The strain of toil, the fret of care.

Teach me Thy patience; still with Thee
In closer, dearer company,
In work that keeps faith sweet and strong,
In trust that triumphs over wrong;

In hope that sends a shining ray
Far down the future's broadening way;
In peace that only Thou canst give,
With Thee, O Master, let me live.

Our most orthodox theology, like our most modern psychology, is as inadequate fully to explain Jesus' communion with God as our own feeble and intermittent religious consciousness is unable to reproduce it. The sheer ultimate fact of Jesus' unequaled awareness of God stands out unique in the spiritual history and experience of humanity. Whatever our theories may be as theologians, whether rigidly fundamentalist or broadly modernist, about such an utterance as Matt. 11:25–30, our personal religious experience as seekers after

God is likely to lead us to a very humble realization of its profound truth. Jesus knows God as no other has known him, and we find God most surely when we follow Jesus most closely.

Jesus has himself warned us (as have all the great mystics also) that there is an element of ultimate incommunicability to any third party in all communion between the human soul and God: "Thou, when thou prayest, enter into thine inner chamber, and having shut thy door, pray to thy Father who is in secret, and thy Father who seeth in secret shall recompense thee" (Matt. 6:6). In view of this significant hint as to the privacy of Jesus' own praying, we need not expect to find the intimacies of his own life with God advertised abroad. As Professor Deissmann, to whose lectures in Berlin and to whose recent book on *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul* this lecture owes much, has put it, "The roots of the olive-tree are hidden in the holy soil of the earth." But here and there, as Deissmann points out, these same vital roots appear for a moment in a revealing light. One of the most significant of these glimpses is afforded by the name for God with which no less than fourteen of Jesus' prayers, as reported in the gospels, begin: "Abba, Father." These two words are identical in meaning, the first being simply a

transliteration into English of the Aramaic word which Jesus evidently used constantly in his own praying. The frequent presence of this word in the brief reports of his prayers that have come down through nineteen centuries to us thus becomes a kind of personal address or signature, attesting them, as it were, in his own hand. But it is much more than simply that; it is also a revealing glimpse deep into Jesus' own life with God.

For the significance of Jesus' use of the term "Abba" does not lie at all in the newness of the idea thus expressed. As Deissmann points out, not only in the Old Testament and in later Judaism, but in Graeco-Roman antiquity also, it was common enough to call God, or a god, Father. What was rather distinctive in Jesus' use of the term was a certain intimacy and confidence and affection, the spiritual quality of which, rather than any intellectual originality, made it his own peculiar and very personal possession. We have been visiting in a home perhaps, and have heard father or mother speak one to the other, or to a child of theirs, with some familiar nickname or term of endearment that we have heard a hundred times before, but that we can never thenceforth hear again without recalling the depth and tenderness of that particular affection which has given it now a new and

deeper meaning. So was it when men heard Jesus speak of God as Father. The early Christians took his Aramaic word over bodily, as if it were almost Jesus' own proper name for God. All over the Mediterranean world it echoed, from Palestine to distant Galatia (Gal. 4:6), and even to Rome (Rom. 8:15). It echoes still around the world wherever the story of Jesus' life has been translated into a new language. Paul declares, in both the passages just quoted, that it is the supreme spiritual privilege of every true follower of Jesus to enter into the same experience of God and fellowship with him which Jesus' own favorite word for God thus so intimately and deeply reveals. John opens up the same endless spiritual vista when he reports the risen Christ as sending this message by Mary to his "brethren": "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God" (John 20:17). The Lord's Prayer begins on the same intimate yet common note: "Our Father . . . ."

This may help to make clearer a fact which is of the utmost importance for any understanding of Jesus. What he has given men in religion is not a definition of God, an argument, or even a doctrine about him, a reasoned proof of his existence, or even (except in a secondary and derived sense)

a new conception of him. What he has given us is something much rarer and more valuable than any of these. It is an experience of God so deep and constant and revealing that we might better call it a life with God. We search in vain through Jesus' teaching for what others—without ever being quite able to put the eternal question beyond a peradventure of intellectual doubt—have nevertheless given us in abundance: abstract argument, formal definition, attempted conclusive proof. Jesus always assumes God, lays his whole stress then upon His moral character as he has himself come to know it in the intimacy of a lifelong acquaintance, and draws his conclusions from this experience as to the duties and privileges of those who thus discover (or to whom it is thus revealed—for the two expressions simply state the same spiritual experience from two sides) that they, too, are the children of God.

This method of Jesus is directly in line with all our human experience of relationship with other persons. More important than the question of any person's knowledge, possessions, or power is the question of his character; for his character will control the use he makes of what he has at his disposal. It is a familiar fact that in our human relations our convictions about the character of other

persons are rarely conclusions that we reach by processes of argument, or think we can summarize in any adequate definition. They rest, not upon argument, but upon personal acquaintance. Two men will estimate the actions, and still more the motives and the character, of a third person quite differently. In deciding which of the two to follow we always ask, "Who knows him best?" Just so Jesus' declarations about the character and purposes of God rest ultimately, not on any theological theory of ours, nor upon any philosophical argument of his, but upon his own intimate acquaintance and daily companionship with God.

Upon this intimate acquaintance with the character of God, Jesus based his whole view of human life, duty, and destiny. As Professor E. F. Scott has convincingly shown in his recent book on *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, ethics and religion are for Jesus so deeply joined that they can never be put asunder, because both alike proceed ultimately from the character of God himself. That single attitude of love as service and sacrifice which, as we saw in the last lecture, Jesus would have to control and inspire all the relationships of life was not based, for him, upon any theory or calculation of social utility, as we moderns tend to do since we have begun to see that only upon some such basis

of "mutual aid" can human life endure, much less advance. Nor yet did Jesus base it, as his modern followers are sometimes charged with doing, upon a romantic and idealizing confidence in "human nature as such," which the tragic facts of life all too often fail to justify. Jesus drew his conception of human life as it ought to be straight from his own personal acquaintance with the character of God as he declared that it eternally is.

It will be well worth our while to see how constant and fundamental is this distinctively religious reference and basis for all Jesus' teaching. With a spiritual daring that takes our breath away, he sets as his single standard for human character, not some dim and distant or visionary ideal, but what he declares to be the actual character of God himself: "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. 5:48). In conformity to that same character he finds the evidence of kinship between human and divine nature, of man's sonship to God: "Love your enemies . . . . that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust" (Matt. 5:44–45). He estimates every human soul, not by what it has been or done as yet, but by its infinite value and possibilities in God's

sight: "Even so it is not the will of your Father who is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish" (Matt. 18:14). He gets his own high perspective on human life and its relative values from his sure sense of God's love and care: "Seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt. 6:33). He looks forward to the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth, not so much by man's achievement as by God's good gift: "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom" (Luke 12:32). By that kingdom he means the carrying out of the will of God in the affairs of earth: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:10). His faith in human immortality rests, not on any philosophical argument or analogy, but upon his own experience of the character of God and the deathless nature of fellowship with him: "He is not the God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him" (Luke 20:38).

Our modern world, distraught with its social problems, and dim in its spiritual vision, is ready enough to listen to the ethical teaching of Jesus as the only adequate answer to its urgent social needs; but it confesses itself perplexed and rather doubtful about Jesus' religion. Neighborliness, good will,

service, the Golden Rule—without these we know now that neither we nor our civilization can be saved. But as for a good God who can be trusted, an eternal purpose that he is working out, a world unseen and eternal in which each of us may have our immortal part—aye, there is the present rub. We are disposed, therefore, to take his ethics, as to the validity of which we are increasingly clear; but we fear we must get along without his religion, as to the validity of which we are increasingly uncertain. It was a keen insight into the characteristic spiritual difficulties of our own generation that lay back of the recent remark of one of our foremost American thinkers in these matters, President A. C. McGiffert. We are living in a time, he said, when men find it easier to believe in Jesus than to believe in God.

These difficulties are too deeply rooted in the intellectual and spiritual conditions of our troubled time to yield to any cursory treatment; but two points bearing directly on them may at least be noted. One is the sheer historical fact, made ever plainer by our best scholarship in these matters, that for Jesus himself the social principles which he laid down were inseparable from his faith in a living God to whose character they conform. As Scott well puts it:

To separate his morality from his religion means nothing else than to tear it up by the roots. . . . . Whether we like it or not, the moral teaching of Jesus is rooted in his religion, and cannot be detached from it. Even his demand for social justice and human brotherhood is based on a religious postulate, and is left hanging in the air when this is withdrawn. There is no way of saving Jesus' ethics at the expense of his religion.[1]

The second fact touches that need for spiritual power which, as we saw in the first lecture, is the supreme spiritual need of our time. Dean Sperry's remark is true of any age, but truest of our own: "The central problem of the religious life is the problem of power, not of moral ways and means."[2] With an increasing clearness of mind as to the attitudes and conduct which its social salvation requires, the twentieth century confesses its spiritual impotence to lift itself to that high level. Through this widening chasm between our social ideals and our spiritual resources run the bitter waters of our contemporary disillusionment. Now it is precisely at this point that the ultimate religious basis of Jesus' way of life comes closest to our most acute modern needs, and offers its support to us also for our personal and social faith. Jesus found in his own experience of God the secret

[1] *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 39, 121.

[2] *The Disciplines of Liberty*, p. 39.

and the source of the spiritual dynamic which his ethical teaching presupposes.

> This energy has its spring in the religion that lies behind the teaching—a religion which must never be confounded with the forms and dogmas whereby it may express itself from time to time. It consists in the last resort in that living faith in God which was the secret of Jesus' own life, and which he communicated to men.[1]

For we shall not understand Jesus, and least of all his "gospel of the Kingdom," unless we remember that God is to him never a theory, an abstraction, or the "Great Perhaps," but always the living and creative source of the spiritual energy which motivates this Kingdom, and ourselves also so far as we belong to it. It is distinctively God's Kingdom; and he is not the God of the dead, but of the living. From him flows forth unceasingly the life that reproduces itself in and among us, and so maintains and extends his Kingdom. In religious language, it is his love that inspires, and his power that alone can bring in, the Kingdom. It is only as we begin to share the experience that lies so richly beneath these inadequate words, that we can ever understand Jesus' constant emphasis on faith in God. God's power to produce this attitude in and through us and to extend its sway among men of

[1] Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

good will is beyond all our human reckoning. We, as his children, may confidently rely on that power, not only when we pray, but as we live. God can and will do in us, through us, and among us, things greater than we dream.

In other and cruder words that may help our little faith to grasp what for Jesus is the supreme spiritual fact of life, the triangle by which we were representing Jesus' world of persons when rightly related to each other is not only a geometrical figure, but an electrical circuit. So long as we live our own lives regardless of God and our neighbor we are not only isolated, but in spiritual darkness, impotence, and chill. But once we begin to love God supremely, and our neighbor as ourselves, light comes to us, power works through us, love warms our hearts within us—and all this is God. The results of life within this spiritual circuit are, and will be, greater than the secular mind of man can conceive. God's little flock, to whom this present experience of the life of the Kingdom has already been given "in part," are justified therefore in a confidence and courage that men outside this spiritual relationship can never understand. If only all men, or even most men, would enter this fellowship, and seek first its values and standards, all lesser goods also would be added unto and

shared among them. This "life more abundant" has not entered into the heart of the natural man to conceive; but God has prepared it for those who love him, and who love his other children with hearts that have caught their love from his own, who "first loved us."

Even more in religion than in other areas of human experience do inadequate words and bloodless concepts get in our way when we search for the deeper realities that lie somewhere behind and beneath them. Yet only that search can show us what has been and is Jesus' great religious gift to men. We cannot adequately describe it as a new thought of God; and it certainly is not a new argument or creed or doctrine about God. It is, rather, a more intimate acquaintance with the character of God, and a deeper experience of life with him in a love that knows no limits, and that forever serves and shares. This experience he has shared with those who have kept company with him and have sought to follow his way of life. They, in their turn, have found that in his companionship God has become more real to them also, and his love more sure and transforming.

Analogies from other realms of human experience help us to understand, though they neither fully explain nor exhaust, this essentially religious

fact. Under the personal guidance of a great teacher we discover new beauties in a poem, a picture, or a symphony that we had not known were there to see. Through the introduction of one who is already a friend we enter far more quickly and deeply into a new friendship. So Jesus opens our eyes, our ears, our hearts, and wills to God's presence and love and transforming power.

But Jesus' own teaching about God shows us how much more there is in the matter—hard as it is to put this deeper experience into words that must inevitably be inadequate.

Jesus had taken his own ideal and way of life straight from the character of God as he knew him; and then he put that ideal utterly and completely into practice. He declared that God loved and sought out the last and the least and the lost among his children; and then he spent his own life in seeking and saving such as Mary Magdalene, and Zacchaeus, and the woman that was a sinner. He bade men love their enemies even as he said God always does—and then, amid the agonies of the cross, he *did* it. What he said that God is always doing he himself put into actual practice. And his friends then and since, looking at him, have been convinced, not only by the confident assertion of his lips, but even more by the irresistible evidence of

his life and love. Through him they have found and experienced God, not so much in argument as in action; working not only in and through Jesus, but within their own hearts as well. So he has revealed God to men, not so much by what he has said as by what he has done—and what he is.

Emerson declared once that "Little souls pay the world with what they do; great souls with what they are." And though our more modern psychology may refuse to admit quite so sharp a contrast between character and action, this insight may help us to understand the central religious fact about Jesus. Alike in his mission, his action, and his character he has expressed and released, as nowhere else it has appeared in human experience, "the Love that is greater than the heart it fills." That experience is what many of us really mean when we speak of God. In the first lecture I quoted a remarkable tribute paid to the last Barrows lecturer by one of his colleagues after his funeral: "There lies the one man who has ever made religion real to me." What Charles R. Henderson did for that man, and for others of his students and friends in Chicago, all that and much more Jesus has done for countless men and women of every race and generation since his own time. He has made not only religion as a personal experience,

but the Living God as an unseen but most real Presence, as a transforming Power, and as the Love that will not let us go, real to them also. In the ancient, profound word of Christian experience, Jesus has revealed God to men.

While the special subject of these lectures is neither Christian doctrine nor Christian experience, there is one central doctrine of Christian faith which causes so much sincere perplexity to many thoughtful folk today, and especially to very large numbers of students both East and West, that it may be worth while even briefly to point out its bearing on the matters we have been considering in this lecture. That doctrine is the divinity, or—since for fundamental thinking in these matters nothing is really gained by any attempt to distinguish the two terms—the deity of Jesus. It may at least help to clear away misunderstandings if three important aspects of this doctrine are pointed out.

The first and most important is that its validity always rests ultimately upon a previous and personal religious experience. Historically—even where theological tradition and controversy have carried its forms of statement farthest into a wilderness of barren intellectualism—the living root of

the doctrine has been nourished, though it may have been generations before, in some such deep religious experience. And personally, especially in our own confused time, the doctrine gets all its living conviction and contagious power from some such experience in the soul of the individual. That experience comes in different ways and under different forms to different men; but somewhere near its heart lies this common element—that as men have followed and kept company with Jesus, he has made God real to them. To those who have not had some such experience belief in the divinity of Jesus must always seem intellectually difficult, if not, indeed, impossible. Argument alone will hardly convince them—only the experience itself can do that. To those who have had such an experience, even in part, the intellectual difficulties that may be involved in its expression will always seem less important than what is to them henceforth a radiant, transforming fact.

All this is plainer to see in the historical record of Jesus' own life than any abstract statement can make it. When Jesus called Peter and Andrew, James and John, that memorable morning by the Sea of Galilee which Mark so vividly describes (1:16–20) he did not make the acceptance of any doctrine about his person a prior condition of their

following him. They, on their part, when at his invitation they left their nets and their families to go after him, had never heard or dreamed of his Messiahship, much less of any doctrine of the Trinity or the Incarnation. Not until they had been months, perhaps years, in his daily company, sharing in his work as well as listening to his teaching, did he ask them, one critical morning, who they held him to be. Peter's immortal answer was based directly on all the experiences that had come to them in his company. It is a thousand pities that the Christian church has so rarely followed in these matters the plain precedent and sound method of her Master himself. His first and foremost word to men has always been an invitation to his companionship and a summons to live in his way and to share his work in the world—never a theological contract guaranteeing salvation in exchange for orthodoxy, to be signed in advance on the dotted line. Belief in the divinity of Christ, in other words, is not an intellectual hurdle at the beginning of the Christian way of life; it is a profound and "revealing" experience that has come to countless men and women in all ages as they have followed Jesus along that way.

A second thing to be noted is that thoughtful men in every age, reflecting on this experience,

have felt the intellectual urge to express it, with the theological conclusions they have drawn from it, in the language and forms of thought of their own day. This natural process, often controversial enough in its immediate occasion, has produced the great historic creeds of the church. When language changes, still more when forms of thought change, and the intellectual molds of an earlier day become inadequate or unreal for the fresh thinking of the new day, the same urge that originally produced the ancient creeds demands their restatement—especially when the creative spiritual experience itself is renewed in any vitality. This is exactly what is happening in our own day and before our own eyes; for that matter, within our own hearts. Conceptions such as the Logos of ancient Greek philosophy, the "Three Persons" of the Trinity, the "one substance" of the Nicene Creed, have become not so much untrue as unreal to the thinking of our own time. Our whole conception of the relationship between humanity and divinity has shifted, meanwhile, from one of metaphysical contrast to one of possible moral likeness. Partly, at least, this shift has come about under the influence of Jesus' own evident assumption that it is possible for men to reproduce the moral character of God (Matt. 5:48). At the same time "the re-

covery of the Jesus of history in something of his original integrity" has become "the outstanding achievement of the religious mind of the last hundred years." In such an unprecedented combination of intellectual changes it is inevitable that the agelong Christian faith and experience should express themselves in new forms.

But more significant meanwhile than these intellectual changes is a third profound and prophetic fact. In our own time, and under the conditions of our own modern life, there has been given to us also a renewal and revitalization of the experience of the Living God in and through the personality and influence of Jesus. Many thoughtful men who realize fully those limitations of the human mind which, as Indian philosophy has always insisted, preclude any complete definition or description of the Infinite, find, nevertheless, the best clue and guide for their daily living and for their ultimate faiths in the deepening readiness of their own hearts and wills to stake everything, here and hereafter, on "the Christlikeness of God"—the faith, that is, that God is eternally such a one as Jesus was, and still proves himself to be when men follow him. Their religion, like Donald Hankey's, consists in "betting your life that there is a God"; their Christianity consists in the same evidence,

given and received, that God is like Jesus in character and purpose.

Asked for further evidence to support a faith that seems so daring in face of the sheer facts of life, they point to the historic facts of Jesus' actual appearance in human life (for he is himself greater and more significant than any so-called "miracle"), and of his influence and power in human history and individual experience. "The simple record of three short years of active life," says the historian Lecky, "has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists." Facing the supreme need of modern life for a spiritual dynamic adequate to its social tasks and promising the progressive realization of its ideals, they find the sufficient supply for that need, as Dr. H. E. Fosdick points out in his latest book, *The Modern Use of the Bible*, precisely in the divine element in Jesus' life and teaching. Jesus does not throw us back upon human nature as it now is, either in ourselves or in our fellows, but reveals to us the Living God, through faith in whom "all things are possible." In the recent words of Dr. Robert E. Speer:

> Christ is not simply a beautiful figure for us to admire across nineteen hundred years. The gospel is not a mere

wholesome moral teaching, part of which we accept, the rest of which we reject because it is now too hard to live by. The gospel is a great deal more than that. The gospel is the living God confronting men's lives today in the record of what Jesus Christ was and did and in the reality of all of this still as a permanent and ever continuing work inside the souls of men, and calling us in our lives . . . . to go out to live his life.

Sound thinking in these great matters must always keep within range of certain obvious and fundamental facts. One is the true and full humanity of Jesus. The earliest gospel tells us frankly that there were things he could not do (Mark 6:5), and Jesus himself said that there were things he did not know (Mark 13:32). The New Testament, like all the best Christian thinking, is very explicit on this point. "There is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus" (I Tim. 2:5) . . . . "in all things . . . . made like unto his brethren" . . . . "in all points tempted like as we are" (Heb. 2:17; 4:15). Another such fact is his historical and spiritual uniqueness among the sons of men. This hardly needs to be labored as a dogma, because, as Dr. Fosdick points out, it is so "painfully obvious." A third fact is that not only in John's gospel ("I and the Father are one. . . . ." "The Father is greater than I" (10:30; 14:28), but even more strikingly

in the Synoptics, Jesus combines a humble reverence before God as supreme (Luke 18:19) with a confident claim to a unique relation to God and a unique power to reveal God to men (Luke 10:22). The fourth, and not least important fact, is that Jesus was always pointing men beyond himself to God. Not simply the Synoptics, but John (12:44) and Paul as well (I Cor. 15:24, 28) recognize this ultimate reference as the final end and aim of his historical mission. Perhaps it is the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of comprehending such diverse facts as these in any single doctrinal formulation that sends many of us back to the simple, profound figures of the New Testament. "I am the way"—our way to God, God's way to us (John 14:6). "It is God . . . . who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (I Cor. 4:6).

Here, as in all great spiritual matters, symbols carry us farther than definitions or dogmas; for all our statements about God must in the nature of things be ultimately symbolic. A beam of sunlight comes streaming down into our world. It is not all of the sun by any means; but if we hold a spectroscope in it, that beam will tell us what the sun is made of ninety million miles away, and what is

the quality of sunlight throughout the physical universe. If, further, being even more interested in the growth and health of life than in the problems of physics, we keep not only our plants but ourselves in that streaming sunlight, the plants will grow into beauty and fruitfulness, and we shall be quickened into the glow of health. So is the life and personality of Jesus of Nazareth, as he lived in Palestine centuries ago like a beam of light from heaven. He does not answer all our quantitative questions about the omniscience or the omnipotence or the omnipresence of God (whatever these high-sounding but elusive words may mean); nor does he solve the philosophic problems of God's metaphysical relation to the universe in which we live. But we Christians dare to believe, on the basis of our own personal experience, that Jesus does reveal to us the divine character, and above all the infinite love, in whose light and warmth we too may live. And as we so live that Love illuminates for us also, step by step, a pathway through time into eternity, that "shineth more and more unto the perfect day."

LECTURE IV

JESUS AND THE MYSTERIES OF LIFE AND DEATH

In a revealing little book on the character and personality of our greatest American, Abraham Lincoln, I once found a flash of insight that has lighted up for me more than one difficult situation in other human experiences as well. The author pointed out that we of a later generation inevitably read Lincoln's life in the rosy retrospect of all that has happened since. The disappointments of 1862, the anxieties of 1863, the postponements and the cruel costs of 1864, the sudden tragedy at the moment of victory in 1865, all stand for us in the softening and transfiguring light of subsequent history, like the successive acts of a drama whose outcome we know in advance. But for Lincoln himself, wrapped in his old gray shawl against the chill of midnight, and waiting haggard and alone for the good news that never seemed to come, it was the disappointments and the anxieties, the slaughter and then the assassin's bullet, that were terribly real—and the ultimate outcome that seemed desperately uncertain.

It is this inexorable necessity of living from moment to moment, when every moment as it comes is always half-dark, big with uncertainty, and sometimes black with mystery, that makes human life never easy and, in its more difficult ranges, so sore a burden. In the crises of life, especially, we have to act in situations that the wisest of us never fully understand, and that develop much faster than our comprehension of them into a future that we cannot clearly foresee. How often we do not know just what to do—and yet we must do something. Mahatma Gandhi has put this poignant aspect of human experience in words that move me deeply whenever I read them:

> Life is a very complex thing, and truth and non-violence present problems which often defy analysis and judgment. One discovers truth, and the method of applying . . . . it . . . . by patient endeavor and silent prayer. I can only assure friends that I spare no pains to grope my way to the right, and that humble and constant endeavor and silent prayer are always my two trusty companions along the weary but beautiful path that all seekers must tread.

Now I am personally convinced that this inevitable tendency to read history in the rosy light of a happy outcome, until some of the darker lines insensibly fade out of the picture as we look back upon it, has affected our view of Jesus also. As an

inevitable result, some of the noblest aspects of his character have been thrown out of focus for us, and some of his most powerful points of contact with our actual human experience have been missed. This is especially the case where men have looked at him through the lenses of some theological theory that has represented him as going through the successive scenes of a prearranged drama, like an actor in a play, performing the actions and repeating the lines that the text called for in each situation. Such lenses must always fail to see some of the deepest lines, both of suffering and of strength, upon the face of Christ. Something also will be lost of the mighty spiritual leverage and lifting power which his cross has brought to bear upon

> The heavy and the weary weight
> Of all this unintelligible world.

We Americans, as all the world knows, take our outdoor sports very seriously. We have recently taken over and given a much wider reference to an athletic expression that bears very directly now upon things infinitely more important than any game. We say that greatness in a batsman at our national game of baseball (the same thing would be equally true of your cricket) is best shown by what he does "in a pinch"—when everything

hangs upon his part in a critical play or series of plays. It is a far harder, and a much greater, achievement to hit safely in the last half of the ninth inning with two men out and the winning run on second base, than early in the game with nothing special at stake; just as twenty-five runs in a last-wicket stand may be worth more than a century in a less exacting situation. Human life itself, like every good game, faces men now and then with these searching tests, when the situation is acutely critical, and the stakes incalculably high.

Now what has given Jesus no small part of his tremendous grip and lifting power upon human life is the way in which he met this elemental and crucial test. His life narrowed and concentrated at the end into a situation which, without any irreverence, we might fairly call the tightest kind of a pinch. It had begun on the sunny hillsides of Galilee as a life of rich unfolding (Luke 2:52), happy teaching and working, and enthusiastic popularity, with eager crowds at his feet. It closed in tragic darkness outside the unheeding walls of Jerusalem, amid shouts of scorn and mockery from the bystanders. Even his best friends had forsaken him then and fled, after one of them had denied him and another had betrayed him to his bitter enemies. What he had taught at the beginning was

thus put to a terrific test by the actual course of events. From that ultimate test both he and his teaching emerged, not only uncompromised, but, in the great phrase of one of his deepest interpreters, "more than conqueror." His words in the Galilean sunshine about faith in God and love to man were now so dramatically illustrated and so powerfully reinforced by what he did in this dark crisis, that through all the centuries since his life and his death have been even stronger spiritual forces in human experience than words alone can ever be.

It is both artificial and inaccurate to set Jesus' life and his death, or his teaching and his career, over against each other as if they stood in contrast, or even in comparison. The deeper truth is that one is the fulfilment and culmination of the other. But it is certainly true that this tremendous climax has deepened and driven home upon the hearts of men the meaning of the whole. As Principal L. P. Jacks has strikingly put it, religion became in Jesus a deed even more than a word. That deed is deeper and richer far in spiritual significance than words alone can ever be, and mightier in influence upon men and history. The gospels hint often in their closing scenes at the silence of Jesus in this crisis, as if he knew that the

time for words was past. So it is not at all strange that Jesus' suffering on the cross, even more than his teaching on the mountainside or from the boat, should since have become not only the characteristic symbol, but in some profound sense the very substance, of his religion. His way of dying was the crown and climax of his way of living; and so even on the cross he himself is still the incarnation and "best evidence" of all that he had said and taught.

We are to think together today about this tragic climax in the life of Jesus, when he faced at their darkest the ultimate mysteries in which our human life is set. I should like at once to take for my own some noble words of Dr. T. R. Glover that remind us how far the sheer facts here transcend our little words and our shallow thinking, and how completely we shall lose our way when we approach the cross of Christ, unless we come in a spirit of humility and reverence controlling mind and heart alike:

> The death of Jesus has been the subject of more thought, one may say without exaggeration, than anything that has occupied the mind of man. No treatment of it ever satisfies listener or reader as complete or adequate; the best gives one the sense of having touched, as it were, the mere hem of the garment. Whenever we look at him, and think again of his death with any firmness and reality, most of our previous thought seems to be of little consequence, and we are left

with the feeling of a great unexplored world before us, of more beyond. In this it resembles the great things of nature, which are never exhausted, which always have mystery and wonder and happiness in reserve. A man who supposes that he can speak with any adequacy of the death of Jesus is simply not thinking about it at all. But the very difficulty of the subject and the failure of attempts to deal with it are compulsive reasons for studying it. It is too central, too vital, to go unstudied. Better to fail than not to attempt it, for failure will at least reveal something of the greatness of the subject.[1]

Let us consider first Jesus' attitude toward success and failure, as it appears in the light and shadow of the cross. To be sure, those two words, "success" and "failure," are much more on our lips, and the issues they raise get far deeper into our hearts, than was ever the case with him. That very fact is significant of the spiritual distance that separates us from him. We westerners, and especially, perhaps, we Americans, are so terribly afraid of failing in anything we undertake that we find it all too easy to limit our ambitions, and even to compromise our standards, in order to be sure to avoid this fatal reproach. Most of us would doubtless rather succeed honestly or fairly if possible, just as we would prefer to be socially popular and yet keep to our own best standards at the same time. But when it comes to a choice, we feel that

[1] *Jesus in the Experience of Men*, p. 52.

we must succeed at any cost—even to our character; we simply dare not face unpopularity and failure, even for the sake of our ideals. This passion for immediate and demonstrable results finds a plausible justification in the shallower forms of pragmatism, and a ready yardstick for measuring success in comparative statistics—especially if they have a "$," or a "£," or even a "Rs" before them. So the "go-getter" very easily becomes our ideal, in religion as well as in business, because he can "deliver the goods." I sometimes think that this is one among several reasons for the prevalence among us Americans of statistical, and especially of financial, standards of success. They are not only very plausible in their appeal, and very comfortable in their quick and concrete results, but they are always delightfully definite and easy to apply. It has been truly said of many of our wealthiest American business men that what they really care about is not so much their money itself as the thrill of the money-making game, and the token of victory in it which money is everywhere acknowledged to be. Modern idols, in other words, are usually made of gold, not simply because of its intrinsic value, but also because gold is the most glittering and the most universally recognized symbol of success.

But now contrast Jesus. His life-work had begun on a rising tide of popularity and influence, but, after a speedy flood, the tide ebbed fast. An outcome that was for a time doubtful became at last tragically certain. But this grim prospect did not lead him, as it so often leads other men, to make any change or compromise in his standards and his faiths. The fact that his way of living and his methods of work did not at the moment seem to be "getting results," but rather just the reverse, did not persuade him to alter them. He never fell a victim to the plausibilities of a shallow pragmatism or of a hasty and merely statistical efficiency. He had faith enough in his cause to die for it, and faith enough in God to die in the darkness alone. He kept his own highest standards and deepest faiths to the bitter end, and left the result with God. If men were minded to call his life and work a failure, they might do so—and did. He made his own appeal from the time-serving judgment of Pilate to the ultimate jurisdiction of God.

And what is the higher and final verdict? History can tell us already that this life which went out in apparent failure has since become the greatest of mankind's spiritual successes. In Jesus as nowhere else in human experience has the poet's promise been fulfilled: ". . . . So shall life succeed

in that it seems to fail." And Christian experience, glimpsing God at work through all this mysterious process of historical and spiritual transmutation, whispers to the hearts and consciences of men—and of nations, too, for that matter—that they need not worry overmuch about the outcome of even the darkest future, or fear too much the opinion of the harshest present, if only they themselves catch and keep Jesus' secret of faith and hope and love, and, at whatever present cost, find and follow as he did the will of God.

Not less steadying and strengthening, to men who live in a world like ours, than Jesus' attitude toward success and failure is his attitude toward the unknown future. With sublime assurance he had lifted men's eyes to the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth, for which he bade his followers work and pray. As now the shadows darkened about his pathway, and as his clear vision foresaw the personal fate that awaited him, the gospels indicate that his mind and heart found unfailing strength for the difficult present in his sure faith in that coming Kingdom, and in the God who would bring it in his own good time. It is a very complicated, and perhaps at many points an insoluble, question, subject therefore to endless debate among students of these matters, as to how far Jesus him-

self may have shared the ideas of his contemporaries concerning the process and method by which the Kingdom was to come, and as to how far the transmission of his teaching to us in the gospels may have been affected by their ideas.

Whatever may be our tentative conclusions on these much mooted matters, two important points about them are perfectly plain. One is that Jesus himself declared his own ignorance of "the day and the hour," which he said were known to God. The other is that the course of history has not fulfilled the expectation certainly held by his early followers, and very possibly also by himself, of a speedy and final establishment of the Kingdom on earth. Our perspective on the relative importance of all these questions is steadied and clarified by Jesus' own constant emphasis on the present reality and certain spread of that way of living in loving fellowship with God and man which, as we have seen, is for him the characteristic mark of the Kingdom, both here and hereafter. It is surely true that through his own life and death that way of living has been made more real and powerful than anywhere else in human history or experience, and is even now advancing to a future greater than we know. Like his disciples, perhaps even like himself, we too are forever setting our

lesser hopes and pinning our feebler faith on some program or event which we trust will bring in the millennium overnight; only to find, as they did, that God's ways are not as our ways, and that God's will is done sometimes where we least expected or even recognized it. So, down the long slow centuries, Jesus shares with us evermore his own victorious faith in the Living God, even when God's great purposes prove larger than any single fulfilment, and move on toward a "divine event" vaster than we mortals know.

So we come, humbly and reverently, within sight of Jesus' attitude toward the will of God, as we catch glimpses of him now and then through the shadows of Gethsemane and the darkness of Calvary. Any man's relation to the immediate issues of success and failure and to the uncertainties of a future that he can only in very small part foresee, depends ultimately upon his attitude toward the mysterious purposes of the Eternal, which at any given moment are even more beyond his present grasp. However much greater than ours the knowledge of God which Jesus certainly had, this was also in some real sense and degree true of him—as anyone will understand who has ever stood within earshot of Gethsemane. Dogmatic debate and theological controversy are hardly in place when

men are upon their knees together—and surely no other attitude is appropriate for any of us in that garden.

The longer Jesus prayed there, the clearer became the path ahead, leading him straight down a narrowing and darkening valley toward a gaunt cross and a rocky tomb. Though that path was not of his own choosing, nor even of his full understanding, the faith that gave him strength and steadiness to follow it was that it was still his Father's will. "The cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" (John 18:11). The direction of God's leading was plain, in spite of the deepening darkness ahead. Into the darkness he went forward, holding to his Father's guiding and sustaining hand when he could not see his face—and reaching out and up after both, when, in the extremity of his mortal anguish, they seemed beyond his grasp. . . . . Now, as we look back across the generations, we can see that thick darkness as a storm cloud on the mountain-top, with heaven and all its sunshine bright above it still. The gaunt cross with its tortured sufferer stands for us on the crest of the centuries, where love at its uttermost met folly and sin at their worst. There, "within the shadow," we can see God most divinely at work, overcoming evil with good.

We live in a harsh world, where men draw their very breath in pain; where new life is always born at the price of anguish; where "the heavy and the weary weight" of the world's sorrow appears not only unintelligible, but undeserved, to those who must nevertheless go on bearing it. No wonder that, in such a world, the cross of Christ has and keeps a spiritual meaning and power far beyond all the theological theories of its efficacy to analyze or explain. Men may forget it, or even turn their backs on it, in days of prosperity and ease. But when dark and cruel days come (as countless sufferers in their inner chambers, like so many common soldiers in the Great War, know all too well), then the souls of men turn back to the suffering Savior upon his knees in Gethsemane, and upon his cross on Calvary, in an instinctive bond of sympathy and understanding which is deeper than any words or explanations. That bond, as Dora Greenwell points out, always knits together human hearts that have suffered deeply. Profounder words than hers were perhaps never spoken upon the mystery of sorrow, and no small part of their power is that they point us to something beyond any words to express:

> The deeper these thoughts sank within me, the more complete became my dissatisfaction with the shallow theories

through which human thinkers have striven to bridge over contradictions which God has left unreconciled, and to reply to questions which He has been pleased to leave unanswered. That death of anguish which Scripture declares to us to be "necessary," though it does not explain wherein its dire necessity resides, convinced me that God was not content to throw, as moralists and theologians can do so easily, the whole weight and accountability of sin and suffering upon man, but was willing, if this burden might not as yet be removed, to share it with His poor, finite, heavily burdened creature. When I looked upon my agonized and dying God, and turned from that world-appealing sight, Christ crucified for us, to look upon life's most perplexed and sorrowful contradictions, I was not met as in intercourse with my fellow-men by the cold platitudes that fall so lightly from the lips of those whose hearts have never known one real pang, nor whose lives one crushing blow. I was not told that all things were ordered for the best, nor assured that the overwhelming disparities of life were but apparent, but I was met from the eyes and brow of Him who was indeed acquainted with grief, by a look of solemn recognition, such as may pass between friends who have endured between them some strange and secret sorrow, and are through it united in a bond that cannot be broken.[1]

Perhaps now we may be in a position to see more clearly what is Jesus' greatest gift to men as they face the ultimate mysteries of life and death. He has not offered us a theory or an explanation of evil in the world, or of pain and sorrow in human experience. Many philosophers have attempted

[1] *A Little Book of Life and Death*, p. 82.

that—none of them more open-eyed or thoroughgoing than your own Indian thinkers. But it usually turns out that this proffered explanation shatters on some one or more of the very facts it sought to comprehend and reconcile. So the Hebrew theory of suffering as invariably a punishment for wrongdoing shattered on the sheer fact of the undeserved suffering of good men like Job. Or again, the explanation contradicts or violates some deep instinct or impulse of life itself, and is therefore feeble against forces stronger than its own logic. So ineffectual was the consistently logical Buddhist analysis of the spring of sorrow when it tried to persuade men to root out all desire—which is to empty life itself of all real content. Thus, beyond all our attempted explanations, the mystery always reappears on a deeper or a higher level.

What Jesus has given us in these ultimate matters is not an explanation at all, but an attitude. He has made that attitude convincing and contagious, not by talking about it, but by living it under a supreme test and in a crucial demonstration. It is an attitude partly of patient submission, even more of confident courage, most of all of overcoming and transforming faith in God. It does not claim to know the full meaning of life's darker and harder experiences; but it dares to

believe that God can give them a meaning, which he will reveal in his own good time to those who meanwhile put their trust in him. Its faith is that out of the darkest present, and what may seem the worst of evils, God is able to further his own purposes of ultimate good for those who make his will their own. In the final exigency and crisis of his own incomparable life, Jesus translated into action and demonstration the counsel of the Psalmist: "Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in him, and he shall bring it to pass." Through his way of dying, even more effectively than by his way of living, he has made real and accessible to us men, as we also in our lesser turn must face the exigencies and mysteries of life and death, that peace and assurance and strength of soul which grow out of and rest upon a living faith in the living God.

So far it may have seemed that the mysteries of life and death which Jesus thus overcame were simply those involved for our mortality in its relation to the uncomprehended universe around us, and the unknown future before us. But there is one mystery which is not only around us like a dark encircling veil; it has a hold and a growing root within our own very human hearts—and therein lies for any sensitive and aspiring man its most bitterly painful and paralyzing aspect. It is

the mystery of evil, around us and within us. We might perhaps all meet like Stoics "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" were it not that our own hearts so often and so sadly let us down.

We have a newspaper in Chicago that is continually crying out against those whom it likes to label "humanitarians, idealists, and reformers." Its main count against them is that they are dreamers and visionaries, living in an airy world of their own hopes and fancies, and never facing the "hard facts" and "realities of life," with their feet on the solid ground of the world as it actually is. And among the hardest of these "hard facts," this newspaper insists, is human nature itself. Now however it may be with the rest of us, this charge cannot fairly be brought against Jesus. He at least faced the darkest and hardest facts of life at their very worst. It is no small part of the claim of his way of living—his religion, that is—upon just those who take life most seriously, that both he and those of his followers who have understood him best have never failed to face squarely "the seamy side of life." They have never denied the terrible reality of evil in the world about us; and some of them have insisted almost overmuch on its presence and power within our own hearts as well.

In the light of the life, and especially of the

death, of Jesus, and also of the characteristic line which Paul soon gave to Christian thought and experience, it can hardly be said that the problem of evil has been blinked. Even more important is the fact that Jesus and his followers have always claimed the discovery and experience of a spiritual power adequate to overcome and transform not only evil in the world without, but sin in men's own hearts. That power is the redeeming love of God, as Jesus has revealed and released it.

It will be well to note with some care how diverse and dark were the hard facts of life that concentrated in the tragedy of the cross. Here at its sharpest is the agelong problem of the suffering of the innocent, accentuated in this case not only by the incomparable character of the sufferer, but even more by the fact that his sufferings were inflicted by the very people he was seeking to serve and help. Here at its stoniest is the apparently heartless indifference of the universe to all human weal or woe. Such a one as Jesus gasps out his life in mortal agony, while the sun goes down and the silent stars come out exactly as if nothing had happened.

Not less dark—as some of the keenest recent thinking on the death of Christ has pointed out—are the aspects of our human nature that reveal

themselves not only in the hard and bitter faces that surround the cross, but hardly less in the futile and tragic figures that are fleeing from it. Here is human stupidity, that can dully torture and slay one whose greatness it has not even begun to understand, and all the while know not what it does. Here is human bigotry, that doubtless thought it was doing God service in putting this man out of the way. Here is the ruthless selfishness of social and ecclesiastical privilege, seeing in the radicalism of this young reformer an ultimate threat to its own place and power. So complacently can a reactionary tradition and institution crush a progressive individual. So fickle is public opinion, that on Friday can turn upon its hero of the previous Sunday with the hoarse cry, "Crucify him." So time-serving and cowardly can high officials like Pilate be, who was willing to purchase popularity at the price of a decision that he knew to be wrong. So abysmally treacherous can a trusted intimate be, who would sell the life of his leader for thirty pieces of silver. So well-meaning, and yet so unreliable, can the best of friends be, who would vehemently declare their readiness to die with him—and then in the crisis deny him, forsake him, and flee. Here around the cross is the whole range of human weakness, from its stupidity, through its frailty, to its sin.

And with what did Jesus meet this awful revelation of human life at its hardest, and human nature at its worst? There is a profound phrase in John's gospel, the double rendering of which lets us look very deep into both the quantity and the quality of the love in the heart of Jesus. He always said that he himself had caught that love straight from the heart of God, and it was his silent answer and sole reliance in this ultimate exigency. "He loved them unto the end"; or, as the margin has it, "He loved them to the uttermost." That is perhaps as near as finite human speech can come to describing, or finite human experience to knowing, the Moral Infinite. Whatever friend might do to Jesus in betrayal or denial, whatever foe might do in cruelty or malice, neither friend nor foe could ever change the quality of his love, or come to the end of it. At the depths no less than on the heights of life there was always more of it, and it was always the same.

Having loved his country, Jesus loved it to the uttermost—and unto the end. The patriotism of Jesus is a most rewarding subject for careful study. There must always have been very plausible and prudential arguments for remaining indefinitely away from Jerusalem and his powerful enemies there, and for devoting long years in some northern

seclusion to the training of his few followers, on whom in any case he and his cause must ultimately rely. But "he steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem," surely in part at least because he loved his country too much to stay away, and would at any cost make one last appeal to his fellow-countrymen at the great patriotic and religious festival of the nation. There is a true patriot's heartbreak in the lament over Jerusalem: "How often would I have gathered thy children together . . . . and ye would not. . . . . If thou hadst known. . . . ."

Having loved both friend and foe alike, he loved them unto the end—and to the uttermost. For his intimates who could not watch with him one hour, and who at the last all forsook him and fled, such love as his uttered itself in a watchful prayer of solicitous intercession long before they knew they needed it; and after they had so dismally failed in the crisis, it supplied the inexhaustible patience and forgiveness and confidence that shine through his remark to Peter in Luke 22:32, and the post-resurrection stories in John 21. For his persecutors as they nailed him to the cross, there was the act as well as the word of a prayer that lets us look deep into the forgiving heart of a love which most of us can only describe and reverence

as divine. "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

One other word I should like to say about the love of Jesus—but only to those of you from whom also, in some hour of utter perplexity or agony of soul, the face of God has been hidden in the darkness. You at least—perhaps you only—will understand. Having loved God, Jesus loved him to the uttermost—and unto the end. Those who read the life of Jesus through the spectacles of any theological theory will always puzzle, and perhaps stumble, over the heart-rending cry from the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" It is itself the first word of an ancient prayer *de profundis* (Ps. 22) in which some unknown sufferer had long before prayed his own way out of utter anguish to a renewed hold on God. Those who have ever had any real occasion to make that same prayer their own, as Jesus himself did, will understand—so far as any human soul ever can understand another's agony and deepest experience.

This prayer, with its whole elementary burden of need, accomplishes more than a hundred comfortable theses against the reasonableness of prayer. This prayer teaches prayer, and it teaches everyone whose faith is a sure inherited wisdom, disturbed by nothing, that communion with God signifies a struggle for God, a struggle between God-nearness and God-forsakenness. Jesus emerged victor. His words of victory,

again "with a loud voice," are the prayer: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."[1]

Having loved God in the clear light of his undimmed presence, Jesus loved him through the darkness also, "unto the end."

The electricians tell us that the arc lights which illuminate our dark streets at night are made up of two carbons meeting each other from above and below, through which the current passes, to burst into brilliant light at their point of contact. The history of Christian thought has shown plainly enough that no single symbol, nor all of them together, can ever exhaust, or even fully explain, the spiritual meaning and power of the cross of Christ in human experience; and any illustration from the inorganic world is peculiarly inadequate for anything so full of life and love as the religion of Jesus. But with all its admitted inadequacies, the arc light may help us a little at just this point. In the cross of Jesus, love at its uttermost met the hard facts of life and human nature at their worst. And just at that point of meeting the love of God revealed in him burst into a light so radiant, that though we may never fully analyze its brightness when we try to look directly at it (for there is mystery in in-

[1] Deissmann, *The Religion of Jesus*, p. 62.

tense light as well as in deep darkness), the darkest paths in human experience have been illuminated by that light sufficiently to dispel our worst fears when we too must enter them; the area within which men may live in the light of fellowship with God has been enlarged to include the full range of human experience; and even the "last lone way" into the mysteries beyond has been brightened by the assurance of the divine companionship.

> Even there shall thy hand lead me,
> And thy right hand shall hold me.

Let us look, then, at certain points and problems on which this revealing light from the cross of Jesus falls with special clearness. It gives us, first, a new sense of what is at stake in Jesus' own death; not only for those who have since taken his name upon them, but also for all religion and all religious faith. Here was one who believed utterly in a God of infinite love, and staked everything in life and death upon that pure and intense faith, as no one else in human history has ever done. What now will happen to him, to his influence, to his cause? Will human history and experience supply any further confirmation of a faith to which his own incomparable life had already given such pragmatic evidence? Or will the event call that faith into serious question? It is in some real sense a test case

for all religion; and we shall see in the next lecture something of its historical and spiritual outcome.

How strangely and significantly that revealing light from the cross reverses the contemporary verdicts of Good Friday, and alters the final relations of the various participants. Pilate and Judas, who had thought to profit by the transaction, stand out despicable now for the centuries to scorn. The cocksure bigotry of scribe and Pharisee, the fickleness of the mob, the travesties occurring in the name of justice, the unreliabilities of good intention, the ultimate impotence of force against faith, the fate of the prophet at the hands of his blind contemporaries, the costly price that love must always pay for the privilege of loving and serving—these are plain here for all men to see. No longer Jesus, but Jews and Romans, Pilate and the Sanhedrin, human courts and codes and churches, cheap expediencies and shallow compromises and quick practicalities, are all on trial here at the bar of history. The Man on the Cross is no longer their victim, but in some deeper sense their judge. What hope would there be of their acquittal if it were not for the forgiving love in his heart?

That same revealing light from the cross will search our own consciences if we stay very long within range of its moral power. We had been say-

ing to ourselves perhaps that the difference between right and wrong is not so important as we had thought, and that sin is not half so serious as our grandfathers used to think—"only a convention," as one American newspaper put it. But this cross and this tortured Christ show all too clearly what sin can do and does do when it has its way in the hearts and affairs of men. So blind can men be, so selfish, and so cruel, and never know it, and even think that they are doing God service. So we ourselves may, for all we know, torture those who love us most, and shout with the crowd on the wrong side, and resist God himself—and meanwhile never realize that anything is wrong. Moreover, in comparison with the love and loyalty and faith of him who hangs on that cross, what claim have we to character or unselfishness? "Again and again," says the great Roman Catholic, George Tyrrell, "I have been tempted to give up the struggle, but always the figure of that strange man hanging on his cross sends me back to my task again." So down the centuries the cross of Christ goes on convicting men and generations of sin—and in every age of new sins that, until this fresh revealing, they had never realized to be sins at all. His cross would be an unendurable judgment bar for every sensitive conscience, personal and social alike, were it not

for the infinitely forgiving love in the heart of him who hangs there.

The same revealing light falls from the cross of Calvary upon the ways of God in this mysterious world. So he reverses the false verdicts of the hour, humbles the proud before the scorn of their successors, vindicates his own prophets, and advances his Kingdom in spite of all that men can do—nay, even through it.

Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne,—
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and, behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above his own.

So God can transform even a tragedy into a means of grace and blessing, bring good out of evil, turn the shameful cross of Jesus' death into the age-long emblem of his glory, make even the wrath of man both to praise him and to forward his great ends, transfigure Good Friday with the light of Easter, reveal the life eternal in the very darkness of the shadow of death, and overcome hate with love and evil with good.

But all this can be done only at tremendous cost. The revealing light of Calvary falls also on a long line of crosses stretching down the centuries. Jesus himself gave explicit warning that one of

these crosses would be waiting for any man who would live in his way. It would be a cross of personal self-denial, on which the lower and the lesser and the worse self must ever and again be crucified if the higher is to live (Matt. 8:34). It would be a cross of social misunderstanding and misrepresentation and even persecution (Matt. 5:10–12). No wonder Paul, who found enough such crosses, both within his own heart and upon the path along which he followed Jesus, spoke of being "crucified with Christ" (Gal. 2:20). He even declared that through his own sufferings for others he could "fill up . . . . that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ." Thereby he became ever more certain of Christ's spiritual companionship along the road of love and sacrifice.

Deepest and most revealing of all is the light from the cross that falls upon the heart of God. When Horace Bushnell said that the cross of Calvary was simply a revelation in time of the eternal cross in the heart of God, he was stating the Christian faith in the divinity of Jesus, not as a theological formula, but as a religious experience. Jesus had declared in sunny Galilee, when there was not an enemy in sight, that it is of the very nature and character of God to love all his children, regardless of their feelings or actions toward him; and that

men too may love each other with that same divine love. But now on Calvary, with not a friendly face in the circle of enemies around his mortal agony, he turned his teaching into action. He loved, as he had always said God loves, to the uttermost and to the end. And through the centuries since, men who have seen and felt that love melting and transforming their hearts have been persuaded even more by what Jesus did than by what he said, that here in him is humanity's clearest revelation of God's infinite and eternal love. Such love never stands aside from our human weakness and stupidity and sin, or from the conditions and limitations of this present world, but suffers with us and for us in them all—and more keenly even than we, because it loves far more than we.

> For he that lives more lives than one
> More deaths than one must die.

Such love will forgive even the chief of sinners: but it will not leave him in his sin. Suffering more than he does or can because of it, love like this will not let him go until he is redeemed from his sin. Such love is the one and only thing that is ultimately irresistible in our moral experience. It is against this divine love that we very human folk are so stupid and sinful—God forgive us! On this divine love we must throw our unworthy little

selves for time and eternity—reassured by the cross of Jesus that God will forgive us also, and save us, and never let us go. Such love as this is utterly beyond our own desert or earning. There is only one response that any man who has really seen and felt its power to the depths of his own soul, can ever make:

When I survey the wondrous cross
  On which the Prince of glory died,
My richest gain I count but loss,
  And pour contempt on all my pride.

Were the whole realm of nature mine,
  That were a present far too small;
Love so amazing, so divine,
  Demands my soul, my life, my all.

LECTURE V

THE LORDSHIP OF JESUS

Nineteen hundred years ago a little company of inconspicuous men and women went out from the city of Jerusalem with a great conviction glowing in their hearts. That conviction, as it has lived and spread from heart to heart through the centuries since, is our concern in this lecture. We hear it on Peter's fervent lips in the earliest utterances of Jesus' first followers as recorded in the Book of Acts. We find it creeping back into the gospels as a favorite title of the early Christians for their Master. All through Paul's letters it rings like a slogan of loyalty, a pledge of obedience, a shout of certain victory. Jesus Christ is Lord!

This conviction rested, for those first followers of Jesus, on three foundations. First and central was the resurrection, by which, in the vivid testimony of I Peter, "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . . according to his great mercy begat us again unto a living hope." The events and experiences of Easter assured them finally and forever that Jesus and his cause were not overthrown,

as they had seemed that black Good Friday night, but were exalted now and victorious, not only over his enemies, but over death itself. Jesus really and surely was what he had claimed to be, the herald and bringer on earth of God's coming Kingdom. Henceforth, in an invisible but most real and mighty fellowship, he was with God, and God with him, and he would go with them also as they went forth witnessing in his name. That living conviction, a plain fact of history to men of all faiths or of none—however they may understand or interpret the events which produced it—transformed the disciples into aggressive witnesses for Christ, changed the course of human history, and produced the Christian church.

This conviction was then reinforced by their own continuing experience, as they bore this witness, of a divine presence and power working in them and through them, which they called the Holy Spirit. It was still further assured by their own expectant and boundless faith for the future. "We see not yet all things subjected to him" (Heb. 2:8); "He must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy . . . . is death. Then . . . . he shall deliver up the kingdom to God . . . . that God may be all in all" (I Cor. 15:24–28).

Upon these foundations of their faith in the Lordship of Jesus there was then built up an enlarging Christian experience, as they carried that faith out into new and ever wider areas of life and found that, in spite of high initial costs (as we pragmatic moderns would say) it finally "worked," winning new spiritual victories wherever they carried it. The greatest man among them, Paul, carried this faith in the Lordship of Jesus down into his own divided heart. His inner life, as his own Roman letter vividly shows us, had been painfully at tension between its better and its worse part; he was inwardly restless, impotent, and wretched, in spite of his zealous activity in the name of religion. Over that inward division and impotence, Christ now proved himself Lord of the human heart, and brought Paul joy and peace and power within himself. "Wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 7:24–25).

Meanwhile a little company of men, whose country we know, but who themselves remain forever anonymous, had taken one of the most revolutionary steps in the history of religion—a step the historical consequences of which have been incalculably great. There are perhaps few more striking illustrations in history of epoch-making

events initiated by nameless men with a great faith in their hearts. Up to that time, as in the Orient to this day, religion had run and had worked usually along racial lines. Where religious toleration and propaganda had begun across these lines, the motives had been largely those of political expediency. The early followers of Jesus themselves had carefully kept their religious activities within their own Jewish limits, according to this ancient tradition. But now these nameless men, the first "foreign missionaries" of their faith, began to share their conviction of the Lordship of Jesus with men of another race and another religious inheritance than their own. To their surprise and delight, it brought to these converts also the same spiritual results and blessings (Acts 11:19–26). In the first rush of its creative energy, the religion that Jesus had given to men thus leaped the barriers and gulfs of race and nationality and became a constructive inter-racial and international force. The Lordship of Jesus at once began to establish itself over men as men, without distinction of color or culture or civilization. It is not without present-day significance, in an age acutely conscious of racial and national divisions and eagerly in search of power to transcend them, that it was precisely in this situation that the term "Christian" first historically

appeared (Acts 11:26) to describe a way of life that was more than national and more than racial, because it was so essentially and universally human.

Then came perhaps the most dramatic assertion of the Lordship of Jesus in all Christian experience. The most powerful political and military institution in human history up to that time, the Roman Empire, turned its full strength against these inconspicuous and helpless folk who called themselves Christians, and compelled thousands of them to choose, on pain of death, between their allegiance to itself and their allegiance to Jesus Christ. It was not an issue which they themselves had deliberately made or forced, as the New Testament clearly shows. But, as has so often been the case when conscientious Christians to this very day have been accused of "turning the world upside down" (Acts 17:6) and "disturbing the peace" of the accepted order of things (Acts 19:23–41), the deep divergence between contemporary folk ways and Jesus' "way" (as this last vivid story significantly calls it) was certain sooner or later to emerge if his followers were really loyal to the inner guidance he had given them. When that ultimately inevitable spiritual issue was joined, thousands of the early Christians met it decisively —though it cost them their lives.

It is one of the minor tragedies of Christian history that the Book of Revelation, in which the poignancy of their issue and the power of their faith throb so intensely, has been distorted by the theological controversies of other days and more prosaic minds until it has become to our western church chiefly a kind of intricate cross-word puzzle, forecasting the course of all later human history for those who have the ingenuity, and think they have the clues, to work it out. Under all its curious and very contemporary imagery, there beats the heart of passionate faith under a terrific test. This deep spiritual significance of the book our literalizing western minds have too largely missed, and your oriental insight must help us recover it. This little company of martyrs were facing the full prestige and power of Rome with a faith which they caught straight from Calvary. Fearing not them which kill the body, they committed the keeping of their souls and of their cause to the Living God, and gave their own lives as final evidence of their faith that, even as against all the kingdoms of this world, Jesus Christ is Lord.

The pomp and power of Rome have long since passed. Their faith, on the other hand, is more widely held and shared than ever before. Today we visit the half-ruined Colosseum chiefly for the

deathless memory of humble men and women who were there thrown to the lions for a faith that force can neither propagate nor destroy. History seems to have had a way of corroborating those who have dared, even at great cost, to carry their faith in the Lordship of Jesus into new areas of life. Almost as striking is its way of quietly but decisively removing from across the path of human progress those men and institutions that have ventured to challenge his widening spiritual sovereignty.

This extension of the Lordship of Jesus to new areas of life has, however, involved frequent compromise, and even obscuration, to Jesus' own plain teachings and way of life. Some of you who are students of English literature may remember Shakespeare's famous figure of the dyer's arm, which perforce takes some color from the stuff it works in. So has it been also even with so pure and precious an influence as that of Jesus in human history. Even more has it been so with the religious movement and organizations that have called themselves by his name. One can hardly understand some of the most significant spiritual developments of our own time—still less, after nineteen intervening centuries, can one clearly understand Jesus himself—unless this fact is frankly recognized and faced.

Illustrations of this process of gradual discoloration are abundant and obvious in Christian history. The Judaizing legalism against which Jesus himself had set his own way of life in sharpest contrast proved nevertheless so tenacious among his immediate successors, as Paul's letter to the Galatians only too clearly shows, that within a generation they were presenting his teaching to the world as if it were a new law to be kept. To this day there are likewise many Christians to whom their religion is simply a series of rules for personal conduct, for theological assent, for ceremonial worship, or for ultimate salvation. As the new religion spread out into that very mixed Graeco-Roman world, it gathered in adherents not only of wide differences in moral character and standards, but of the most diverse religious traditions and ideas. Sects and dogmas began to multiply as one or another of these influences became here or there controlling. Presently, in the face of the plain teaching of Jesus on the inwardness of true religion as an attitude of life toward God and man, the passion of that mystery-loving age for external and officially guaranteed means of grace and salvation had introduced into the early church a submerging flood of sacramentarianism and sacerdotalism. Within two hundred years Christianity had be-

come an ecclesiastical institution that Jesus himself would hardly have recognized, much less approved. Rapid and serious as was this early discoloration, it is simply an acute instance of the continuing and inevitable discoloration which Jesus' way of life always suffers as it works in the very imperfect medium of our human nature, with its crude ideas, its tenacious traditions, its sins that do so easily beset us. As von Hügel profoundly puts it:

> Man's personality, the instrument of all his fuller and deeper apprehensions, is constituted by the presence and harmonization of a whole mass of energies and intimations belonging to different levels and values; and not one of these can (in the long run and for mankind at large) be left aside or left unchecked by the others without grave drawback to that personality. Religion is, indeed, the deepest of energizings and intimations within man's entirety, but it is not the only one; and though through religion alone God becomes definitely revealed to man as Self-conscious Spirit, as an Object, as *the* Object, of direct, explicit adoration, yet these other energies and intimations are also willed by God and come from Him and (in the long run and for mankind at large) are necessary to man's health and balance even in religion itself. . . . . Such an at all adequate and balanced development of any one group of energies and intimations, let alone of the entire personality, is of necessity, except in rare souls or in rare moments of ordinary souls, a difficult and slow process. It has been so certainly with ethics and humaneness. It has been so still more with religion.[1]

[1] F. von Hügel, *Essays and Addresses*, p. 46.

In spite of these obvious and frankly admitted inconsistencies and faults of historic Christianity, there has always been alive and accessible within it the figure and personality of Jesus himself. Therein lies its abiding significance and characteristic secret. Like all the other great religions of mankind, as it has moved down the stream of time it has picked up accretions faster than any ship in tropic seas. It has absorbed into this rapidly enlarging mass elements inconsistent not only with each other, but with its own deepest self. In this process it has thus become what Harnack has so often called the Roman Catholic church, a *complexus oppositorum*. The Christian church has never been, and is not now, fully Christian; sometimes it has been pathetically and even tragically un-Christ-like. But it has kept ever within itself one mighty source of self-purification and power for revitalization—the personality of Jesus.

In this central point of these lectures competent scholars are strikingly agreed: Our American professor, F. L. Anderson, puts it thus:

> One of the most remarkable features of Christianity is her faculty of self-criticism and self-purification. In this she seems almost to reproduce the functions of a living thing in throwing off what is useless and effete. The impulse and the power are from within. . . . . She finds in herself an amazing ability to adapt herself to new situations. . . . . All this

power of self-purification, all this capacity for profounder insight and growing vision, all this adaptability to human hearts and minds in every age, all this stir of hope and certainty of faith, in short, all this actuality and potency of life she constantly refers to the spirit and power of Jesus working in her. In him, and him alone, she recognizes the source and impulse of her vital energy.[1]

An English scholar, Professor Foakes Jackson, has stated the same great truth in a single pregnant sentence: "Since in every age the church is tempted to regard her interpretation of her Lord as final and complete, a return to the historic Christ is a constant necessity, and the only cause of progress:[2] Professor H. R. Mackintosh, of Edinburgh, writes to the same effect: "Whereas every other historic and prophetic religion makes progress by transcending its founder, Christianity has grown in life and power in exact proportion as from time to time it recovers touch with Jesus, submits more loyally to His will, and accepts with a deeper gratitude the life of worship he imparts."[3] The outstanding religious leader of the younger generation in America, Dr. H. E. Fosdick, in a recent notable sermon on "The Rediscovery of Jesus," stated it in a single sentence:

[1] *The Man of Nazareth*, p. 7.

[2] "Cambridge Theological Essays," *Christ in History*, p. 476 n.

[3] *The Originality of the Christian Message*, p. 26.

"Wherever in history there has been a genuine reformation that even for a little while lifted the church to be a cleansing and transforming agency in society, at the heart of it has lain one thing, the rediscovery of Jesus."

Hence the spiritual significance and promise of what we found in the first lecture to be widely characteristic of our own day—the turning of men the world around to Jesus for fresh light and power for our deepest needs. Our own age—our own younger generation especially—is rediscovering Jesus. Whenever that happens, as it is happening once more before our very eyes, there has resulted a great spiritual reformation and revitalization. Men who have gone "back to Christ" with a genuine purpose to follow him have always found themselves speedily summoned to go forward with Christ to new conquests in his name.

There is no more striking illustration of this process of spiritual revision and revitalization quickened by the rediscovery of Jesus, than the very conviction itself which is the subject of this lecture. The term "Lord" is an ancient and, as any visitor to India soon discovers, a very widespread, religious title. But it is also, and long has been, a political and social and military title as well. It is not strange, therefore, that in the course of this

long history its religious usage, like the dyer's arm, has been deeply colored by these other connotations which were inevitably in men's minds as they used it. A lord is a person of high authority, before whom not only a befitting reverence, but a correct use of proper titles, is necessary on pain of serious penalty. A lord is an authority supported by such military force and power of compulsion that he can impose his sovereign will on all and sundry who dare to resist or even to ignore it. One has only to think how deeply these ideas and connotations of political and military lordship have penetrated and influenced religious life and thought in every land, to realize the extent of this single discoloration, and its compromising and confusing effect upon religion.

Nothing is clearer in the whole teaching and practice of Jesus than the explicitness with which he rejected these political and military conceptions of lordship and substituted for them his own characteristic and deeply religious one. For himself he did not ask honorable titles correctly applied, or formal homage punctiliously rendered. He called rather for something far simpler and far harder—the actual and personal following of his way of life: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that

doeth the will of my Father" (Matt. 7:21). "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" (Luke 6:46). In the light of words as explicit and exacting as these, the strenuous insistence of the Christian church on the ascription of correct theological titles to her Lord, and her slowness to seek and to carry out the practical application of his principles to human life, seem equally far astray from Jesus himself.

No less explicit was his repudiation of the characteristic political and social standards of greatness and success, and of military methods of conquest, for himself and his followers alike:

> Ye know that they who are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For the Son of man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.[1]

It would be hard to conceive any clearer statement of Jesus' fundamental principle that real spiritual greatness is revealed and measured, not by homage paid or enforced, but by service rendered. He based his own claim to lordship, not upon titles or status, but upon his service and self-sacrifice for

[1] Mark 10:42–45.

mankind. No one can understand the new simplifications that are so rapidly coming into Christian thinking, or the new urgencies that are quickening our search for the twentieth-century application of the principles of Jesus, who does not see that these are one inevitable result of the rediscovery in our own time of Jesus' own conception of the true meaning of his Lordship and of our discipleship.

This same process of revision, simplification, and vitalization, quickened by the rediscovery of Jesus, is going on today in every realm to which the term "Christian" may even in any partial sense be applied. It goes on with different degrees of clearness and energy, however, and at different rates of speed, in different persons; and, similarly, also in the various groups that call themselves Christian. It is not less a factor in the changing Christian thought of our time than the external intellectual influences pointed out in the first lecture. In other words, the restatement of Christian faith in terms simpler and spiritually more fundamental, which is in process all about us, is the result not only of intellectual pressure from without, but of quickened spiritual energies from within, springing from renewed contact with Jesus himself.

It is one of the great glories of Christian history and of Christian faith that in every age its best

minds and most loyal hearts have taken their conviction of the Lordship of Jesus out into the philosophical and scientific thinking of their own time, and confidently claimed for him its highest contemporary categories. So Jewish Messianism, Greek and Roman and scholastic philosophy, and now modern scholarship, have each in turn contributed their forms of thought to the utterance of Christian experience and conviction. So each in turn has proved finally inadequate, and sometimes inaccurate besides, as a permanent vehicle for that experience and conviction as they have broadened and deepened down the centuries. With every rediscovery of Jesus has come an inevitable sense of incongruity, and often even of contradiction, between these historic statements of Christian doctrine and Jesus' own plain principles and way of life. Men's eyes have suddenly been opened by a fresh look at Jesus, to the fact that their own views of life, their own "thoughts of God" and "hopes of heaven" have been far from fully Christian, if Jesus himself is to be taken as the embodiment of what Christian really means. Both in Christian thinking and practice, the dyer's arm must always appear sadly discolored by the very human medium in which it has been working, whenever it is compared with the whiteness of his "mighty arm

laid bare." Those who are so sorely troubled by the restatements of Christian faith which our own generation is making do not always realize that these have been prompted, not only by what modern science and historical research have discovered, but by a new vision of Christ himself. And surely a real belief in Jesus' Lordship requires that when any divergence appears between his plain teaching about God and man and our human systems of theology, whether ancient or modern, we shall follow him at all costs—even the cost of being thought heretical.

All this sheds light also on the widespread recent changes in the Christian attitude toward ritual and ceremony in religious worship, and toward forms of ecclesiastical organization. It was not only natural, but inevitable, that as the Christian church spread through the long centuries to different lands and races, with their different customs and interests, it should adopt such forms of worship and administration as it found most helpful to its own purposes. It is equally natural, and indeed inevitable, that in our own time, different individual temperaments, different groups, different races, should find one or other of these forms more serviceable than others, and should likewise develop new forms to fit new situations.

The rediscovery of Jesus is one of the surest of correctives for dogmatism and for the assumption of the right of dictatorship by any individual or group or race in matters ceremonial or ecclesiastical. It shows clearly enough that Jesus' main emphasis was always otherwhere, on "the weightier matters" that concern man's unmediated relations with God and with his neighbor. Christians ought never to magnify as primary, issues of ceremony and polity which were for him always secondary, on which, moreover, down the centuries his followers have often had to pay a tragically high price for spiritual liberty. The Lordship of Jesus surely requires us to follow his teachings and perspectives, not only as against our own theological traditions, but also as against our own ecclesiastical preferences and prejudices. This is the heart of the profoundly Christian position which the Chinese church is taking in these matters, considerably in advance of its brethren in the West: "Agreed to differ, but resolved to love." And it will be the real root of that Christian unity which can only grow out of such a perspective and such a spirit.

But it is not only, or even chiefly, in matters distinctively religious, and claimed, therefore, by the Christian church as her special prerogative, that the Lordship of Jesus has thus asserted and

extended itself. In his notable book, *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*, Professor W. E. Hocking points out that the function of religion in life may be much more truly described as one of creative fertility than as one of immediate or practical utility. Some of its best fruits spring from inconspicuous seeds scattered over far and wide areas of human experience, and growing up then in unexpected places, like the mustard seed of Jesus' own parable, into great trees. The value of such a productive source of life and fruitfulness can never be measured by its immediate and quantitative output, as if it were a mere machine. Just so the influence of Jesus has continually overpassed the limits marked out either by himself or by his followers as inclosing their own particular preserve; and seeds of his planting or quickening have sprung up half-unrecognized into fruitfulness, all over the broadest areas of human life.

Slavery was, in Jesus' own time, an ancient and an honorable institution, upon which as a foundation the social and economic life of mankind had been built for many more centuries than recorded history can count. There is no indication in the New Testament that Jesus ever took issue with it himself, and abundant evidence that the early Christians accepted it without question as part of

the long-established order of things. Nearly eighteen centuries passed before men began to see that between the institution of slavery and Jesus' principle of the infinite value of each and every human soul there was an irreducible inconsistency, and that therefore, sooner or later, there was certain to be an irreconcilable conflict. When that issue first began to emerge there were not wanting statesmen as wise as Edmund Burke to declare that slavery was an ineradicable evil, which it was hopeless to try to banish from human life. There were not wanting ecclesiastics to defend slavery by arguments drawn from the letter of the Old Testament, and even of the New. And there were plenty of hard-headed Americans, in northern cities as well as on southern plantations, to advise letting the slavery issue alone, on the ground that to agitate it would hurt business and divide the nation. It is not claimed that all those who co-operated, from various motives and with various contributions, in the movement that banished slavery from British and American life forever, were consciously acknowledging the principles or the Lordship of Jesus; though the religious motives and appeal of such influential anti-slavery leaders as William Wilberforce, John Woolman, John Brown, and Harriet Beecher Stowe were plain:

In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea,
With a glory in his bosom that transfigures you and me.
As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free,
For God is marching on.

What is claimed is simply that the principles and way of life that Jesus gave to men have worked far more deeply and widely than even his followers have consciously recognized. Where they have come into conflict with even the oldest and strongest of human institutions political and social, it is not the authority of Jesus that has finally been overthrown.

Dr. T. R. Glover of Cambridge University, in his recent book, *Jesus in the Experience of Men*, has an illuminating chapter on "The Humanizing of Life," in which he reviews the influence of Jesus on the individual, the family, the school, and on philanthropic, economic, and international relationships. He quotes John Morley: "The advance of the community depends not merely on the improvement and elevation of its moral maxims, but also on the quickening of moral sensibility. The latter work has mostly been effected, when it has been effected on a large scale, by teachers of a certain singular personal quality." Particularly striking is the evidence he traces down the centuries of the social consequences of the new valuation of the

individual man, declared by Jesus, reinforced by Paul with a new sanction in Romans 14:15, and sharply put by Synesius more than three centuries later in a letter of protest to the new Roman governor of Cyrenaica against his oppression of the people: "Man is a thing of price, for Christ died for him." That enhanced estimate of human significance, emphatically taught and utterly put into practice by Jesus, has been the moral atmosphere in which alone such social reforms as the emancipation and elevation of women, the protection and training of children, the enfranchisement and education of the laboring and the depressed classes in any society, can go forward. Only in that atmosphere can the masses of men successfully maintain themselves against political tyranny on the one hand and economic exploitation on the other. That atmosphere provides the only moral climate in which democracy, with its faith in the capacities of the ordinary man and its emphasis on his social duties as well as his personal rights, can permanently thrive. It is significant in this last connection that it is those peoples of the earth among whom the influence of Jesus has worked longest and deepest, even though by no means adequately yet, that have been able to make democracy even partially successful. Jesus himself once compared

the working of the Kingdom of God in human life to "leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till it was all leavened" (Matt. 13:33). Thinking along these lines, one finds deep and prophetic meaning in Dr. Glover's own summary: "In one region and another of experience humanity has experimented with Jesus, constantly with new and unexpected results; it has explored him with anxiety; it has enjoyed him; and by exploring and enjoying him it has found more and more in him, and it has grown in the process."[1]

Against this background of history and experience, both personal and social, the ancient Christian faith in the Lordship of Jesus has taken on an even deeper and wider meaning in our own generation for those who share it as the "Faith of our fathers, living still." It is no longer simply or even chiefly a theological proposition to be debated stoutly with those whose philosophical traditions, forms of thought, or points of view are different from our own. Nor is it simply a pious phrase to be quoted with proper unction from Acts 10:36 or Philippians 2:10–11, as if the fervent repetition of a formula were the sum of Christian duty and loyalty. The Lordship of Jesus is a living faith to be carried out into the whole area of human life, and

[1] *Jesus in the Experience of Men*, Introduction, p. vi.

applied in personal and social practice over all its range and extent. It holds that Jesus' principles and way of life are not only valid, but highest and best in all fields of worthy human interest and activity, and for all the relations of men with each other. It refuses to admit that there is any department of life that is really worth living, whether business or pleasure, politics or international affairs, to which Jesus' principles and standards do not apply. Such an admission would limit the redeeming love and power of God as revealed in Christ, and would deny the New Testament faith that he is "Lord of all," to whom "all authority hath been given . . . . in heaven and on earth" (Acts 10:36; Matt. 28:1).

It is, of course, sadly evident that, to borrow another New Testament phrase, "we see not yet all things subjected to him" (Heb. 2:8). The devils of greed and selfishness and passion, of hate and prejudice and force still hold sway, unchecked and sometimes even unchallenged, over wide areas of human life. But to say that it always must be so in business and racial and international relations, to abandon to these devils the spiritual sovereignty that there, too, belongs to the "God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" is, from any Christian point of view, the real paganism and denial of God in our

modern life—and a far more serious denial than any purely intellectual atheism or agnosticism. In our age, as in every other, the central Christian task is, by the witness of daily living quite as much as of the spoken word, to "make Jesus Lord," "that in all things he might have the pre-eminence" (Col. 1:18). This cannot be brought about, either by God or man, save by that love and service and sacrifice in which Jesus himself put all his trust. No cosmic catastrophe and no power of forcible compulsion, human or divine, can establish on earth that Kingdom which is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. 14:17). When that great consummation of the divine purpose shall be fulfilled, "knoweth no one . . . . neither the Son, but the Father only" (Matt. 24:36). But though that Kingdom be not yet fully come here on earth, "it is in heaven." Our agelong Christian crusade does not seek the present recovery or the permanent establishment of any fixed form of creed or organization, ancient or modern, ecclesiastical or social. With the heartening faith, "It is the will of God," it seeks rather, at whatever cost, to make Jesus Lord and Master of all our own living, and of all human life.

This assertion of the Lordship of Jesus over all the areas of life that have too often been marked

off as secular, and over all the social as well as the personal life of men, is not at all, as some have feared, an enterprise separate from or alien to the missionary impulse which has been one of the vital energies of Christianity from the beginning. Rather it is the crown and completion thereof. The missionary enterprise, in all its worthiest periods and its best representatives, has been no condescending piece of racial or religious patronage, but the outward thrust and outreach of a loyalty to Christ and an experience of him that have caught from Jesus himself his sharing spirit. A Christianity in any land that is not missionary at heart would prove thereby that it had lost its Master's mighty impulse of love and service and sacrifice. All down the Christian centuries that constraining love of Christ has thrust men and women forth across the miles and the oceans to carry to new corners of the earth the story of his life and death. Now that same vital impulse is pushing the Christian church out to claim new areas of life for his name and spirit. It is more and more plainly evident that in our increasingly interdependent modern world neither of these great Christian tasks can go successfully forward without the vigorous prosecution of the other. The civilization of the so-called "Christian" countries must be far more wide-

ly and thoroughly Christianized if their religion is to commend itself consistently and convincingly to intelligent men in other lands; and the conquering faith that alone will suffice for the evangelization of the social order at home will have the spiritual vitality to propagate itself geographically abroad. Thus the two outreaches, social and missionary, are really expressions of the same evangelistic energy, seeking throughout the world and throughout human life to "Crown Him Lord of all."

This great task must always relate itself to, and define itself in terms of, the conditions and problems that press for social and spiritual solution in any given land at any given time. In our own America at the present time the younger generation is increasingly conscious of three great problems that thus confront and challenge the Christian mind and conscience. One is the dollar-chasing commercialism for which we Americans have a not wholly unwarranted reputation in other countries. In a continent of unequaled natural resources, settled and developed within a few generations by immigrants far more of whom came to make their fortune than to find freedom to worship God, the temptation has inevitably been very strong to measure life by the abundance of things possessed. The necessities as well as the traditions

of pioneer life have likewise emphasized individual advantage more than the common welfare, and shaped human relations along lines of personal philanthropy rather than of social justice.

There has, however, come a great awakening of social conscience and spiritual perspective on all these matters of late years, both within and without the Christian church. Once more the influence of Jesus has fast and far outrun its ecclesiastical and conventional limitations. When President Coolidge reminds a company of business men that the best type of men of affairs have begun to be uneasy nowadays unless they are rendering service as well as making profits, when business clubs spring up all over the country with such slogans as "He profits most who serves best," when hundreds of business firms are trying out various methods of increasing the sense of mutual responsibility and joint service between employers and employees, there are still audible, even in America, some echoes, however dim and confused, of the warnings and appeals of Jesus. The question still remains open as to just what modifications in the structure as well as in the spirit of capitalism may prove to be necessary before it can square with the standards of Jesus. Those who have seriously faced the issues raised by such a clear-thought

challenge as that of R. H. Tawney's *An Acquisitive Society* can hardly again take that question lightly. Perhaps no country and no generation in human history has had more reason to ponder humbly and earnestly Jesus' outspoken warnings against the spiritual and social perils of wealth, than has America in the post-war world. But at least young America at home, hardly less than her critics abroad, has begun to recognize here one of the central problems and tasks of the twentieth century from any Christian point of view. Can the spirit of man, reinforced and guided by the spirit of God, dominate and subdue into stewardship and serviceability the wealth of the world? Or will it, like Saul of old, fall upon its own sword in spiritual defeat and disaster?

India, at least as well as any other country, has learned, through the unhappy experiences of many of her students and travelers among us, how largely unsolved and how far from Christian are our racial relations in America. It is possible that both America and India have reason at this point to study afresh Jesus' parable of the mote and the beam (Matt. 7:1–5). Certainly the younger generation in America is more acutely aware than ever of our own failures at this very difficult and increasingly sensitive point in our own national life.

One great element of hope and promise in the present situation is the recent development, in communities all over the South, where the relations between the white and black races are most intimate and sensitive, of more than eight hundred interracial committees, on which men and women of good will from both races sit together to work out solutions for their common local problems. In the formation of these committees (further information about which may be found in J. H. Oldham's recent careful study of *Christianity and Race Relations*) Christian men and women of both races have taken an active, though by no means the only, part.

These two problems, too complicated for any quick and simple panacea, may well have to be worked through by several successive generations to a final solution which no man is wise enough now to foresee. There remains a third great problem, as to the way toward the solution of which equally thoughtful and earnest men may differ, but as to the final outcome of which they are agreed. The mind and conscience of the younger generation in many lands, within and outside of the Christian church alike, is awakening to the present challenge of the ancient institution of war with a response like that of their fathers, a century or two ago, to

the similar challenge of slavery. The fundamental incompatibility of both these ancient institutions with the principles and standards of Jesus is plain. It is likewise evident, in the one case as in the other, that when once this conflict has clearly emerged there can be no lasting compromise. Either the authority of Jesus, or the institution of war—in spite of its deep roots in human nature and history and its continuing occasions in modern life—will finally have to go. There is large difference of opinion and method as to the process and probable time of its abolition; but history gives much encouragement as to the ultimate result. Still more encouraging is the deepening conviction and resolution of the younger generation in many lands as it recognizes in the institution of war "mankind's chief collective sin," and girds itself for the expulsion from our international life of this great enemy of the spirit of Jesus.

In relation to these great matters, no less than to personal living, the Lordship of Jesus becomes finally an individual and very personal issue. There has recently been taken from among us in America, all too early in a career which we ill could spare, a man who represents at its best the characteristic Christian contribution toward the solution of great problems like these.

John Joseph Eagan, of Atlanta, who died on March 30, was one of the most successful business men that the South has produced since the Civil War. Business ability such as he possessed would have been conspicuous in another man. In Mr. Eagan, however, there was something so much greater than business ability as completely to overshadow it. The one thing apparent to the thousands who knew him was that John J. Eagan was a simple follower of Jesus Christ. This was his real business, and everything he did was related to this central interest of his life.

So writes the executive director of the Commission on Inter-racial Co-operation throughout the South, of which Mr. Eagan himself had been the chairman, and in the formation of which he had been a prime mover.

In working for co-operation between the white and Negro races he saw another opportunity to apply Christian principles to human relations. He was sure that the Christian spirit, and it alone, could remove prejudice and overcome injustices.[1]

It will interest you of India to know that on his last sick-bed John J. Eagan was eagerly reading all that he could find in our American magazines about Mahatma Gandhi, and that "the release of Gandhi from prison was a day of celebration with this business man in the midst of a fight for life." But it may interest you hardly less to know what were the attitudes and the ideals of this successful

[1] *Federal Council Bulletin*, May-June, 1924.

man of large affairs, president of the American Cast Iron Pipe Company, toward the problems of modern industry.

In his will, written in his own hand, he left the great plant which he had built up at Birmingham to the men who had worked with him. It is theirs. The last paragraph of the will provides that the company shall be conducted for the sole purpose of supplying its products to the public at actual cost, after providing for reasonable salaries and wages and for the maintenance and extension of the business, "my object being," the will concludes, "to insure service both to the purchasing public and to labor, on the basis of the Golden Rule given by our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ."

Mr. Eagan began an address on "The True Function of Industry" to a company of employers shortly before his last illness, with these words: "The true function of industry today is *making men*." He closed it thus:

May I close with a personal word? Men have asked: "Is your plan practical?" That is not the question. The question is: "Is it right?" Some men say: "If you are sure that the adoption of the principles of Jesus Christ in my business will make it successful, I will go all the way." There has not been a business man since the beginning of time who would not be glad to do that. If we cannot put Jesus Christ in business, we ought to get out of business, and get somewhere we can go with Jesus Christ.

There is the Lordship of Jesus in our own generation!

LECTURE VI

JESUS AND THE FUTURE

The subject of this final lecture was suggested by an American friend of India, long resident and active here and widely known among Indian students, Dr. E. Stanley Jones. In a very profitable conversation about the Barrows Lectures just before I left Chicago, he said to me, "I hope you will give your final lecture on 'Jesus and the Future.' "

It was a congenial theme to suggest to any American, especially to one of the younger generation. One of our most strongly marked national characteristics, in contrast with the people of older and maturer countries, is our preoccupation with a future of which we are not only hopeful, but expectant. Our history is brief, and seems to us important chiefly as the beginning of greater things; what matters most is our destiny, about which we are perhaps somewhat overconfident. I have begun to believe, since I came to India, that this forward-looking attitude may yet prove to be a real inner bond between your country and ours. Though your history is much older than ours, and your sense of a great heritage naturally far stronger, no

one can move among you in friendly converse these days without a strong sense that a new India is in the making, looking to a great future as well as a great past. It is most appropriate, therefore, that we should ask together what Jesus may have to do with and for that future.

This same question, moreover, is inseparable from any adequate consideration of the influence of Jesus in human history, or of the nature and meaning of the religion which has called itself by his name. In these lectures we have steadily understood and interpreted essential Christianity as a way of life, incarnated in Jesus himself. Now any "way," whether it lies between towns, between eras, or between time and eternity, is better described and defined in terms of its destination than of its starting-point. We can only hope to find the real meaning of Jesus for human life when we face the future courageously and progressively under his leadership. Paul must have meant something of this kind by that inspiring motto of his own life which is one of his many rich bequests to his fellow-Christians down the centuries: "Forgetting the things which are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the upward calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 3:13–14).

One of the foremost of our American religious thinkers, Dean W. L. Sperry of Harvard University, in the first essay of his *Disciplines of Liberty* entitled "What Is a Christian?" has strikingly put some of the conclusions which follow directly from this conception of the Christian religion as a way of life:

> There is in the fourth gospel a working definition of Christianity which our time would do well to ponder. It differs from the conventional static definitions of the Christian idea in terms of intellectual rest in that it seeks to define the Christian life in the terms of motion. "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out," says Christ. Or, as the original has it more accurately, in the present participle, "Him that is coming to me I will in no wise cast out."
>
> The Christian idea may submit to the theological snapshot from time to time. These photographs of its infancy and immaturity may be gathered into a history of dogma. They may even be thrown before the mind's eye as motion pictures of the Christian life. But in themselves they are not that life itself. Each of them is an inert representation once removed from life, and impotent of itself to reproduce life.
>
> If the vague religious consciousness of our time, groping after some working definition of the Christian religion, is to find any statement congenial to its own methods of thought and intelligible to a generation alive with the sense of movement, that definition must take the form of the covenant rather than of the creed, an expression of an ultimate ideal to be realized in the way of discipline and discipleship, not by a guidebook account of the halfway houses of Christian history.

Whatever may be said of the content of the creeds, the general outlines of the character of Christ are reasonably intelligible and familiar. His moral courage, his patience, his sympathy, his purity, his catholic love, are beyond all question of a doubt. The individual life and the social order which contemplate these qualities and which are "on the way" to them may safely be defined as Christian, whatever the untraveled road that still lies between the present fact and the ultimate ideal.[1]

In that last pregnant sentence from Dean Sperry lies implicit most of what the younger generation of Christians in the West has to say of those inconsistencies which you of the Orient have not been slow to mark and to point out, between our western professions and our practice both individual and social. We frankly admit and sincerely bewail their existence; and we have set our faces forward to leave them behind. Our real claim to call ourselves Christians rests not so much on our achievements as on our aspirations. In the words of one of our favorite hymns, we strive to:

> Run the straight race through God's good grace,
> Lift up thine eyes, and seek his face;
> Life with its way before us lies,
> Christ is the path, and Christ the prize.

This look to the future, however, does not shut us off from the experience and the lessons of the

[1] *The Disciplines of Liberty*, p. 18.

long past. One of our early American patriots, Patrick Henry, said once in an oration famous in our political history that he knew no light to guide the feet of men through this dark world except "the lamp of experience." There is religious meaning also in his memorable phrase. "Jesus in the Experience of Men"—to borrow the suggestive title of Dr. T. R. Glover's book—has been an actual and potent fact of history now for nearly nineteen centuries. From that long experience we can surely learn something of what we may expect from the influence of Jesus in the future.

We might well note in passing that therein lies a very important truth about Jesus, which is not less significant for you of India than for us in the West. As recent critical scholarship has amply shown (see *The Historicity of Jesus*, by S. J. Case), he is no myth or legend, but a definite historical character whose existence and influence are alike deeply rooted in the processes of actual history. This actuality and power of Jesus in history and experience alike is independent of the many questions of detail about his life on which modern scholars find themselves unable to agree or even to decide. There is, therefore, much less reason than some timid Christians have feared, for religious men to be disturbed about either the processes or the re-

sults of historical scholarship as applied to the life of Jesus. Indeed, it is this very scholarship that has contributed not a little to that clearer vision of Jesus as he lived and taught among men which Dean Sperry calls "the outstanding achievement of the religious mind of the last hundred years."

The best Christian thinking has always recognized in this historical actuality of Jesus, a steadying corrective against the twin tendencies toward metaphysical speculation and toward legend-spinning imagination, to which all the great religions of the world, Christianity included, have too often fallen victims. Any religion, in its long voyage down the centuries, is in danger of being unbalanced and finally capsized by its mounting cargo of dogma and legend, unless it is stabilized by some such decisive historical ballast. Thus central and controlling for Christianity is the personality of Jesus.

What, now, do this actual history and these nineteen centuries of human experience with Jesus suggest as to the probable nature and direction of his influence over the future of mankind?

First, the influence of Jesus never has been, and now seems less than ever likely to be, limited to any special country, culture, group, race, or generation of men. Born into an intensely Jewish heritage and environment, he has become through

the centuries, more truly than any other man in human history, a citizen of the world. This has come about, not through the protestation of any pale, and too often ineffectual, generalities such as those which cosmopolitanism in every age has proclaimed, but rather through his spiritual emigration from land to land and race to race, and his naturalization of himself within the indigenous forms of thought and action of each new-found home. So he has moved out from his Jewish birthplace through the Greek and the Roman and the western worlds, and now before our modern eyes is domesticating himself once more in his native Orient. In his world-encircling spiritual journey this traveler of the ages has often had to move on out of the theological, ecclesiastical, and cultural dwellings of those wayside hosts who, with too much self-confidence and too little understanding of their guest, have regarded him as their special possession, and their house as his permanent home. The spiritual experience of the two at Emmaus (Luke 24:13–35) is repeated by creeds and churches and races down the centuries: he tarries long enough to bless and transfigure every home that will receive him as its guest—but then he goes forth again upon that other and wider mission of which he himself speaks to every would-be host: "Other

sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd" (John 10:16).

A second plain fact of history is that in nineteen centuries of human progress Jesus has never been outgrown; and the probability heightens steadily that he never will be outgrown. There have been tremendous changes in the world since his day. The political institutions under which he lived, the social and economic order of which he was a part, have long since passed, never to return. The language he spoke is now known only to a few scholars; the land he lived in, once an international highway, is of interest and significance to most of us largely because of him. Not only has he survived all these changes; he has even gained influence through them. They have helped to set him free from the local and particular elements of his setting into the universal human relations where his abiding significance lies. In our own time of rapid transition, new scientific discoveries and improved historical research have greatly changed our views of the past that has shaped us and of the universe in which we live. Ancient systems of thought, ancient books of wisdom, ancient rules for conduct, are being re-examined and reappraised in this process; and few indeed of them can maintain any

modern prestige, except as facts of history that were important in a bygone day. But so far the result of such historical criticism, when applied to his own life and work, seems to be to set him away from the creeds and institutions of his own and of later times in a heightened personal vividness and power. It is significant that the real difficulty of our modern age with Jesus is not that we have gone beyond him, but that he stands spiritually so high above us; his demands and standards seem too far beyond the reach of our poor human nature in this sadly imperfect world. The judgment of Goethe a century ago appears now, in the light of all that has happened since, more reasonable than ever. He declared that no matter how far mankind may advance in wisdom and progress, beyond the simple teachings of Jesus of Nazareth it can never go.

This superiority of Jesus to circumstance and time seems the more likely to continue because of the deep and enduring foundations on which it is based. It rests in part on the permanent influence and significance of great personalities in human experience. Rules and systems, creeds and ceremonies, may easily grow old, and finally become a

> Dead fact stranded on the shore
> Of the oblivious years.

But the great men and women, even of the remote past, live on still for those who seek to know them better. They stir afresh the curiosity of generation after generation, and stretch out again the horizons of human experience with their originality and adventurousness. Of them all that is in some degree true which Shakespeare declared of one such:

> Age cannot wither her, nor custom stale
> Her infinite variety.

What we moderns call "personality" is the name our ignorance uses for this mysterious but most real fact and force. Some of us possess more of it; others much less. Raised to its highest power, as in the great personalities of history, it is strangely superior not only to time and place, but also to race and station.

> There is neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed, nor Birth,
> When two strong men stand face to face, tho' they come from the ends of the earth!

Two great personalities in your own Indian history have fascinated me as I have worked through its long and complicated record in preparation for these lectures. Against its confused background of dynasties and wars, races and religions, Asoka, who lived more than twenty centuries ago, and Akbar, nearly twenty centuries later, will always

stand out for me vivid and compelling. Just so Socrates and Alexander, Buddha and Confucius, Caesar and Francis, Luther and Goethe, Napoleon and Lincoln and Gladstone, Wilson and Gandhi, will fascinate future generations as they have dazzled or perplexed their own contemporaries—like diamonds from the many facets and mysterious depths of which light flashes down the centuries. We and our successors also will read new interpretations and new valuations of them without end—how many such the last few years alone have produced! Great personalities never grow old, and remain forever dynamic.

Contact with other personalities, moreover, ignites within us the mysterious sparks which kindle and energize our own highest capacities. Some other person, usually of the opposite sex, arouses and releases our latent capacity for love, and may then concentrate and perpetuate it into the richest, happiest, and most fruitful experience that human life knows. Every normal human being has other latent capacities, intellectual or aesthetic, moral and religious. It is usually some kindling personality that first quickens these also into imitative activity, and then has the opportunity to train them into independent development. Great personalities of the past often keep more of this

kindling power than is possessed by lesser folk in the living present. All this is especially true in morals and religion; character and religious experience are thus caught personally even more than they are abstractly taught. But it holds also for all the relations of life. A great institution or a great cause, political or patriotic or social, can command the utmost loyalty and devotion of some few men, whatever its personal leadership may be. Most of us, however, have still in reserve that "last full measure of devotion," which we give only to our trusted leaders, our closest friends, our dearest loved ones.

Some of the deepest springs of human action are suggested by a story which an old football player once told me of a hard-fought game for the season's championship. The score was 0 to 0 at half-time. Early in the second half my friend's captain, much the best player on his team, was carried off the field with a sprained ankle. His final word to his mates, as they laid him down on the sidelines, was, "Now, fellows, you've got to win for my sake." And they did. That appeal of personal loyalty and affection did something more for them and within them than even his physical presence had hitherto done. "For his sake" they could play, even in his absence, as they had never in their lives played

before. That holds true likewise of some things more important in human life than any game.

Now, quite apart for the moment from the theological valuations which Christian thought has given to Jesus, or even from the religious experience which he has quickened in thousands of his followers, it is plain to any student of history that Jesus must have had a most extraordinary and dynamic personality. It may, indeed, be fairly questioned—on grounds quite independent of personal religious faith—whether in all human history there has ever been another personality of equal power. Back of the gospel stories, through the New Testament page, down the long centuries of history, far beyond the circles of his exponents and defenders, he has lived and worked on, vivid and compelling. We are gathered here for these lectures, hundreds of us, of different races, languages, and faiths (and almost none of us of his own race or faith) because of our common interest in him. A German scholar, Professor Weinel, in his informing book, *Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, has studied this personal influence of Jesus on the men and movements of a single century in modern history, with impressive result. Truly, to quote Mr. Natarajan again, "The personality of the Master himself stands before the world in compelling grandeur."

Even deeper than this power of personality as a foundation for Jesus' abiding influence is the nature of the facts and forces in human experience with which he has dealt. The central place and tremendous power of religion in human life is once more revealed by the fact that Jesus, whose personal interests and activities were distinctively, and indeed exclusively, religious, should have come to occupy the position in the history and experience of humanity which he unquestionably holds. Less perhaps in India than in any other land on earth is it necessary to argue the truth of Sabatier's dictum that "man is incurably religious"; for nowhere else in the world is religion taken more seriously, or shared more widely, than among you. It is just these universally human and elementally powerful religious capacities that Jesus, down the centuries and all the world around, has proved his power both to stimulate and to satisfy. So long as men are restless after faith in life's meaning and destiny, are weighed down by life's burdens and stricken with its sorrows, are distraught and divided within themselves and embroiled with each other, are deluded by life's lesser values and dissatisfied till they find the higher, are hungry in all their best moments for companionship with God—so long, that is, as men are men as we know them

today—so long will Jesus keep his appeal to them and his hold on them, no matter how skilful or how comfortable in things external their civilization may become.

It should be noted carefully that the central, unique, and final place which Christian experience and thinking have always given to Jesus, is due to the combination in him of both these factors. Christians are never satisfied to think or speak of him simply as one, or even as the chief, among the great personalities of human history; or to group him simply as one among the saints and prophets of the world's religions, even though he be ranked as the foremost. Much as he may and does have in common with them to the objective eye, the Christian can never forget or fail to take large account of the satisfaction Jesus has brought to the deepest religious needs of his own grateful heart. Just as any friend's or lover's estimate of his beloved must seem unconvincing to a third party until he has shared the experience which prompts it, so the agelong Christian insistence on the uniqueness and finality of Jesus grows out of the religious experience of those who, following his way of life under his personal guidance, have found him bringing them to God and God to them. This combination of historical and mystical elements is characteristic

of the Christian attitude toward Jesus, which is always impoverished when either is left out. It is plainly recognizable, for instance, in George Matheson's striking statement of this spiritual timelessness of Jesus which we are just considering:

> Son of Man, whenever I doubt of life, I think of Thee. Nothing is so impossible as that Thou shouldest be dead. I can imagine the hills to dissolve in vapor and the stars to melt in smoke, and the rivers to empty themselves in sheer exhaustion: but I feel no limit in Thee. Thou never growest old to me. Last century is old, last year is an obsolete fashion, but Thou art not obsolete. Thou art abreast of all the centuries. I have never come up with Thee, modern as I am.

A third reason why Jesus has never been outgrown, and seems unlikely to be, lies in the fact, so strongly emphasized in these lectures, that Jesus gives men not rules but principles. Rules by their very nature deal with definite situations and conditions, and give direction for the particular case: they must therefore lose their validity when the circumstances change. Principles, on the other hand, may indeed require fresh interpretation and application as conditions change, but they hold their validity permanently. Jesus' moral teaching has kept its appeal and power through the changing centuries and amid diverse races and cultures, chiefly because it has dealt with the elemental and

universal ethical problems inherent in human nature as such, and in the social relations of men with their fellow-men; partly also because it was stated in terms drawn from what Sir George Adam Smith once called "the great essential experiences of human life." Similarly, his religious teaching, though it grew out of his own Jewish inheritance, stands in sharp contrast with the ceremonial and nationalistic elements of that heritage, in that it meets the deepest spiritual needs of men as men. Its profoundest experiences and faiths are stated in terms that are neither racial nor ritualistic, but filial and fraternal. God is our common Father, and all his children ought to live together as brethren in their Father's house.

The question constantly and widely recurs among students who are beginning to think for themselves in these matters, whether these simple and universal principles are not separable from their historic connection with organized Christianity, and even from their connection with Jesus himself. Why cannot they be combined with the best elements in other great religions, into a composite faith in which all the great prophets of humanity shall have each his own place of honor and reverence? It is a plausible proposal, and always has a strong appeal to those in every land for whom

comprehensive and logical generalities in these matters seem sufficient and decisive. Is such an eclectic development likely in the future?

Such questions are always far easier to raise than to answer. Certain considerations bearing on this one may, however, be pointed out. The first is that religion in human experience, like all living things, is born and grows by processes far more akin to spontaneous reproduction from within than to deliberate manufacture from without. In these processes, for all the higher religions at least, creative personalities have always taken a vital part. Upon such organic processes of growth from previous forms of life, and upon the appearance (unpredictable and unproducible) of such personalities, religious, even more than political and social, progress seems to be conditioned. A second is implicit in the penetrating observation of the German thinker, Novalis, a century ago, that all eclectics are really skeptics, and the more eclectic the more skeptic. Religion gets its vital energies from its glowing faiths, and these are created not so much by logical synthesis as by contagious experience.

Back of both these considerations lies the fundamental fact that religion is far more a driving force than an abstract proposition or argument, and can never dispense with the personal relations and

embodiments which energize it. The influence of Jesus, as we have seen, has come even more through what he did than what he taught, and has been inseparable from his personality. An age whose deepest need is for power to achieve its visions and meet its unparalleled opportunities, can hardly afford to cut itself off from the perennial sources of spiritual energy in the personality of Jesus, released through personal relationship to him. Napoleon, himself one of the strongest personalities in history, and master of some loyalties that have greatly inspired men, touched one of the deepest secrets of Jesus' power in his famous remark that he himself had sought to found an empire on force, and had failed; but that Jesus had founded his empire on love, with the result that today there are millions who would die for him.

The leverage of Jesus on human life may, therefore, be expected to work chiefly through individuals who have caught something of his spirit and attitudes, and are seeking to follow his way of life under his personal guidance. It will by no means be limited to those who call themselves by any particular "name or sign"—even his own. On any cloudy day our earth is still lighted and warmed by the sunshine whose origin we cannot then see and do not always recognize. But his in-

fluence will be most direct and powerful where this personal nexus has its full hold upon his friends and followers. This comes not so much from any theological prescription or ecclesiastical requirement on their part, as from certain fundamental characteristics of human nature, and of religious, as of all other human experience.

It is not less natural that those individuals to whom this personal relationship and experience have become the most precious of all possessions should seek to share them with others. Even more natural is it that they should gather together in spiritual fellowship with others who share already this same religious interest and experience. The Christian evangelistic and missionary enterprise, often objected to in our sensitive modern age as "propaganda," springs ultimately from the sharing and serving spirit of Jesus himself. The absence of any impulse to it would, therefore, from any really Christian point of view, be far more serious than are the admittedly complicated and delicate problems involved in carrying it out. So also with the Christian church itself. Our younger generation, keenly conscious of the past mistakes and failures and the present inadequacies and inconsistencies of institutionalized religion, may too easily forget that the social organization of religion,

as of every other human interest, is not only natural but inevitable in a world where none of us liveth to himself, and where we are all members one of another. And if it be true that the best remedy for the evils of democracy is more democracy, it is even truer that the only solution for the problems of organized Christianity is more of the spirit of Jesus.

It is not the province of these lectures to attempt the application in detail of Jesus' principles and way of life to the characteristic problems of our modern time, urgent as that task undoubtedly is for the Christian mind and conscience of today. For every individual and every group who takes Jesus seriously life has become, and all life must be made, an adventure "in daily applications of Christ"—to borrow a fine phrase of old Richard Baxter. It may be pointed out in conclusion, however, that certain aspects of the future will plainly stand in special need of such intelligent and persistent working out of his principles and spirit in terms of today and tomorrow.

It is already evident to every thoughtful man that, as improved means of communication and increased interdependence draw the world closer together, international relationships will loom larger and larger in the future, for good or for evil. Only

an international religion can hope to be a very potent factor toward the solution of the many problems here involved. If religion in the future, as so often in the past, is to run along national or racial lines, it will only accentuate the differences and frictions that are already numerous enough at all points of contact between peoples. A religion that can cut across racial and continental divisions and bind men as men together in a common spiritual consciousness and experience, will be an international asset that mankind can ill spare. Can there be any real question that Christianity, among the great religions of the world, has shown most hope and promise of such internationalization? And even if its achievements in this direction be still incomplete, is there any personality in human history, in any field, who has so decisively proved himself an international fact and an internationalizing force as has Jesus?

The frictions and strains of modern life are not limited to the relations between nations. Within the domestic life of every country, and indeed of every community, as life has become more complex, there are increasingly evident divergencies of interest and impulse between different groups and classes, sects and races, which threaten to turn every democracy into an arena of contending

factions. In these internal conflicts the prizes go to the stronger, the wounds to the weaker, and the consciousness of the common weal is weakened if not lost in the stress of competition. When these structural strains become too great, the prospect of democracy itself must become more and more precarious. In the closing chapter of his last great work, *Modern Democracies*, which gathers up the study and thought of a notable lifetime, Lord Bryce points out that the future of democracy will depend upon two factors—the progress of mankind in wisdom and virtue, and the future of religion. Every nation (and, not least, your own and our own) that faces these great social issues of the unknown future in an acute form will find certain elements in the religion of Jesus of peculiar value. Among these are his insistence on the social stewardship of those who have more than their share of the good things of life, his message of hope and inspiration to those who have less than their share, and his emphasis to both alike on their duties as even more urgent than their rights. Modern democracies also should not overlook Jesus' proved power, during his lifetime and ever since, to speak directly and effectively to the average man and to the underprivileged groups, and to give them a new faith in themselves and in their future. His democ-

ratizing influence has historically always tended to level up, rather than to level down.

Jesus' final and decisive appeal is always to the individual. While it is on the one hand a peremptory summons to a new and higher way of life—what the New Testament often calls repentance, and evangelical theology has included within its "conversion"—it is also the heralding of a gospel. It is good news. Modern life, especially in a democracy, gives large responsibilities as well as new privileges to the individual man. It loads his mind and conscience with the complexities of social and international problems which once were left to kings and their ministers to worry about, but have now become his personal concern. The result may easily be to overload and dishearten those who take these responsibilities most seriously. Just here comes Jesus with his glad tidings: that while we are doing our duty, God may be trusted to do his; and that though there are crosses enough of personal sacrifice and sorrow, and even of temporary failure, along his way of love and service, they never mark the end of the road, but may become milestones into God's own Kingdom. Therefore Jesus' friends and followers are to be not only generous but joyous; "steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch

as ye know that your labor is not vain in the Lord" (I Cor. 15:58).

Two things, however, every follower of Jesus must remember. One is that Jesus never has given and never will give him explicit rules either for his own life or for his social duties, but will give him guiding principles instead. He must not expect from Jesus, therefore, directions in detail on his own problems, but he can catch from Jesus an attitude and spirit which he must then himself express in appropriate action within his own situation. There will inevitably be honest differences of opinion, and even of conduct, between equally sincere and high-minded men in this constant process of application; and they must carefully guard against judging each other, since each is responsible directly to Christ, and to him alone. "To his own lord he standeth or falleth."

This point is so important for our modern world, and Dean Sperry of Harvard has stated it in such trenchant and illuminating words, that they deserve ample quotation:

> The effort of a simple and devoted piety in our time to define Christianity and to establish its authority as an answer to the question, "What would Jesus do?" is doomed to failure. The plain answer to this question in nine out of ten of life's practical crises is, "We do not know what Jesus would

do." We know what his principles are; we sense the outlines of his character; but just what they mean in any single tangled and complex situation before us the gospels do not tell us.

Does Jesus stand for the forty-four-hour week in the mills as against the forty-eight-hour week? If he stands for the former, does he stand for the candid demand for only a four- or five-hour working day? Has he anything to say on the problem of interest? What dividends may a Christian accept on his money investments? Is a 4 per cent dividend Christian and a 10 per cent dividend un-Christian? What would the attitude of Jesus be toward the problem of modern citizenship and statesmanship? Could he align himself with any party? If so, which party? And if with no party, how would he relate himself to the Caesars of our day? Would he preach, as Paul and Peter preached, the duty of obedience to the powers that be, or would he preach, with Thoreau, the duty of civil disobedience?

These are the practical problems which the average Christian faces today. His daily life brings them all to him as the raw stuff out of which, by his choice, he is to fashion his Christian character. And yet even the most simple and pious soul—the *anima naturaliter Christiana*—reads and rereads his gospels in vain for any authoritative utterance upon these concrete moral options. He turns soberly away from the gospels with the mature conviction that he must answer these questions for himself, that the historical Jesus will not relieve him of the privileges and responsibilities of his human freedom.[1]

But though we may not look to Jesus for detailed directions on our own contemporary issues,

[1] *The Disciplines of Liberty*, pp. 36–37.

those who undertake to follow him today must never forget that they follow not upon their own terms, but on his. When he has spoken to the mind and conscience of his followers from the first generation until now, his claim and call have been uncompromising, and they have ignored or disobeyed him at their own spiritual peril. He has never disguised the exacting conditions of his discipleship (Luke 14:25–33). This peremptory note of authority comes not from the requirement of any third party whatsoever, but from the very nature of religion itself, and of the personal relation which you of India so well understand, between the *guru* and his *chela*. Only to those who have met the conditions and paid the price of following Jesus have his deeper disclosures and his mightier equipments ever been given.

This, too, is far plainer and more persuasive, when we see it turned into reality in the life of a man, than abstract statement or argument can ever make it. When I was a student in the German universities sixteen years ago, the whole theological world was agog over a brilliant book on *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, then recently published by a young professor at Strasbourg named Albert Schweitzer. Its historical and theological views seemed so radical as to take most men's

breath away. Not only had its author come into rapid intellectual eminence; he was already one of the world's great organists, and its foremost interpreter of Bach's music. The news seemed incredible, therefore, that, at the age of about thirty, Dr. Schweitzer had abandoned the world of letters and of art, and was qualifying himself as a general practitioner in medicine in order to go to Central Africa as a medical missionary!

His work there these last years is best described in his own words, and Indians, who know what is at stake for the future of the world in the race relationships of Africa, will perhaps best understand its significance:

> The operation is finished, and in the hardly lighted dormitory I watch for the sick man's awakening. Scarcely has he recovered consciousness when he stares about him and ejaculates again and again: "I have no more pain! I have no more pain!" . . . . His hand feels for mine and will not let it go. Then I begin to tell him and the others who are in the room that it is the Lord Jesus who has told the doctor and his wife to come to the Ogowe, and that white people in Europe give them the money to live here and cure the sick negroes. Then I have to answer questions as to who these white people are, where they live, and how they know that the natives suffer so much from sickness. The African sun is shining through the coffee bushes into the dark shed, but we, black and white, sit side by side and feel that we know by experience the meaning of the words: "And all ye are brethren."

That is light shining, not only in the heart of the Dark Continent, but on the heart of the world's darkening problem of race. That is evidence also, given by deed more convincingly than by any word, that the authority and power of Jesus over and through men does not depend so much upon their historical or theological views about him as on their personal relation to him. This man, far more radical in his theology than any of us, is also much more Christlike. What was it that induced this brilliant thinker—Dale lecturer at Oxford in 1922 on "The Philosophy of Civilization"—what was it that persuaded this world-renowned musician to give up his secure professor's chair and his beloved organ-seat for a scantily equipped hospital in darkest Africa, maintained by his own financial efforts in addition to his medical labors? What does he mean when he says that the Lord Jesus told him to go there?

Schweitzer gives us the answer himself in the memorable words with which he concluded *The Quest of the Historical Jesus:*

He comes to us as one unknown, without a name, as of old, by the lakeside, he came to those men who knew him not. He speaks to us the same words: "Follow thou me!" and sets us to the tasks which he has to fulfil for our time. He commands. And to those who obey him, whether they be wise or

simple, he will reveal himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings, which they shall pass through in his fellowship, and, as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience who he is.

There, far better than in any words of mine, is the substance and summary of the Barrows Lectures for 1924–25.

INDEX

Acquaintance, with God, 66
Akbar, 160
Anderson, F. L., *The Man of Nazareth*, 126
Asoka, 160
Atlantic Monthly, 7

Baldwin, William H., Jr., 4
Barrows, Dr. John Henry, ix, xi
Barrows: Lectures, 6, 28, 60; Lectureship, ix, xii, xiii, 1
Brown, John, 136
Buddha, 49
Burke, Edmund, 136
Burton, President Ernest DeWitt, xiv, 11, 48

Cairo, xvi
Calcutta, xvi
Capernaum, 29, 32, 58
Case, S. J., The *Historicity of Jesus*, 155
Christian church, 27
Clarke, W. N., *The Ideal of Jesus*, 36, 37, 41, 48
Colosseum, 122
Confucius, 49
Coolidge, Calvin, 144

Datta, Dr. S. K., xv
Deissmann, *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, 62, 108
Disillusionment, 12

Eagan, John J., 148
Experience: of God, 65; rediscovery of Jesus, 134

Fairbairn, Dr. A.M., ix
Fosdick, Harry Emerson, 24, 28; *The Modern Use of the Bible*, 81, 82

Galatia, 64
Galilee, Lake of, 29
Gamaliel, Rabbi, 31
Gandhi, Mahatma, 7, 28, 86, 148, 161
Glover, T. R., *Jesus in the Experience of Men*, 34, 90 f., 137
God: as Father, 64; omniscience of, 84; symbols of, 83; *see also* Kingdom of God
Good Friday, 104, 110
Goodspeed, George S., xi
Great War, xiii, 10, 11, 26, 98

Hall, Dr. Charles Cuthbert, ix, 2, 59
Hankey, Donald, religion of, 80
Harper, President William R., x
Haskell, Caroline E., ix., x, xii, 6
Henderson, Dr. Charles R., x, xii, 2, 75
Henry, Patrick, 155
Hocking, W. E., *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*, 135
Hugel, F. von, *Essays and Addresses*, 125

India, xvi, 29
Indian Student Movement, 26

Jacks, L. P., 89
Jackson, Foakes, *Christ in History*, 127
Jerusalem, 1, 126
Jesus, 22; appeal of, 174; attitude of, 100; communion with God, 61; doctrine of the divinity of, 76; life with God, 63; lordship of, 121 ff.; personality of, 84, 163; place given to, 165; and prayer, 58, 62; principles of, 44, 171; power of, 179; as a religious teacher, 57; supreme values of life to, 45; teaching of, 50; view of human life, 46; way of life, 52, 57; world of, 45; *see also* Experience
Jones, E. Stanley, 24, 151
Joses, Rabbi, 31
Judas, 110

Kingdom of God, 47, 71; advance of, 112; on earth, 95

Lincoln, Abraham, personality of, 85
Lord, definition of term, 128
Lord's Prayer, 58

McGiffert, A. C., 69
Mackintosh, H. R., *The Originality of the Christian Message*, 127
Madras, xvi
Magdalene, Mary, 74
Matheson, George, 166
Meir, Rabbi, 31
Middle Ages, 15
Morgenthau, Henry, 26
Mozoomdar, P. C., 7

Narada, *Bhakti Sutras*, 35
Natarajan, K., ed., *Indian Social Reformer*, 23, 163
Niagara: Falls, 8; River, 10, 13

Oldham, J. H., *Christianity and Race Relations*, 146

Palestine, 64
Pilate, 110

Religion, 33; as a deed, 89
Revelation, Book of, 122
Ross, G. A. Johnston, *The Universality of Jesus*, 56

Samaritan, Good, 43
Schweitzer, Albert, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 177
Scott, E. F., *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, 25, 43, 66
Service, 4
Shaw, George Bernard, 23
Smith, Sir George Adam, 167
Speer, Dr. Robert E., 81
Sperry, W. L., *The Disciplines of Liberty*, 25, 60, 70, 153, 156
Stowe, Harriet Beecher, 136
Studdert-Kennedy, G. A., 14, 16
Students, 12, 26, 27, 51; American, 1, 4, 28; Chinese, 4, 24; Indian, 1, 4; of Madras, 51; of Palestine, 1

INDEX

Tagore, *Gitanjali*, 7
Tawney, R. H., *An Acquisitive Society*, 21, 145
Ten Commandments, 30
Tyrrell, George, 111

University of Chicago, The, x, 2, 19; President, xii; Press, xii; *see also* Burton, Harper

Vivekananda, Swami, 6

Weinel, *Jesus im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, 163
Wilberforce, William, 136
Wilson, Woodrow, 26
Woolman, John, 136
World's Parliament of Religions, 6, 59
World's Student Christian Movement, 26

Zacchaeus, 74

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.